1: Niederle--59 E-5 1911 E16 Slavic Peoples E16
Sorbs

101 At the period for which we possess somewhat more detailed historical data about them, the Polabian Slavs were divided into three great families:

1. The Obotrites in Mecklenburg, Lüneburg and Holstein (as far as the Varnava River), whence they penetrated into the Old Mark;

2. The Luticl or Veletiz between the Oder, the sea, the Varnava and the Elbe;

3. The Sorbs on the middle Elbe between the Verra*, the Havel, and the Bobrawa.

175 From the time when history records the presence of the Slavs
● 177 on the Elbe, their history has been but a long struggle for existence; they carried on this struggle simultaneously against the German Empire and the Roman Church. The campaign undertaken by the Germans against the Polabian Slavs was at the same time of a political, national, and religious character. The Slavs resisted energetically, but the struggle was too unequal. The Germans had as allies the Danes, and upon occasion also the Polish and Czech prines. Furthermore, they were not in agreement among themselves.

Under Charlemagne and his immediate successors, the Germans achieved only insignificant victories.

The Saxon dynasty was more fortunate; the entire country of the Polabians fell into German hands. The conquest was accomplished by the /93/ Margraves. The Slavs were not only conquered, but were in a short time denationalized. Beginning with the twelfth century German colonization penetrated into their country; in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the Germans were already superior in numbers, and by the fifteenth century only a few rare specimens of the Slav race were to be found.

On the island of Rugen* (Rouiana* in Slavic) the Slavs disappeared in 1404; on the Elbe towards the middle of the sixteenth century, they occupied only the districts of Luchow* and Danneberg*, the southern part of the district of Blekede*, a third of that of Ulzen*, and the northern section of the Old Mark (Altmark). Further to the east no more than a few remains were to be found in Mecklenburg, which was still rather thickly populated by Slavs in the thirteenth century (between the rivers Elde and Suda), and in Brandenburg in the district of Priegnitz (Brizan). But this rather sizeable group in Luneburg, was completely unable to maintain itself. In 1671 there were still Slavs

175
177 there; about 1700 they were in great measure Germanized; the last Slav group was that of the Dravani (Drawaina) in the district of Luchow which even today is called Wendland, country of the Wends.

177-19 The Slavic language disappeared between 1750 and 1766. It was in 1751 that mass was celebrated in Slavic for the last time.^1

161 In the years 1890-1900 the newspapers reported, according to A. Parczewski, that the census /94/ of 1890 had found 570 Slavs-Wends still in this region. But it was an error. The official census had indeed found in the Luchow area 570 Wends, but they spoke only German.

197 The Slavic tongue in this region has been dead for more than a century, as Mr. Muka reported without hesitation.^2 He was sent out as an investigator by the Academy of Sciences of Cracow.

000 However, the Slavic character is still found in great measure in the type and in the manner of life of the inhabitants of the Wendland.

101
175 Originally the Sorbs of this region^2 occupied in a compact mass all of the country situated between the Saale, the Verra*, the Fulda, the upper Havel, and the Spree. They extended as far as Frankfort on the Oder, on the Lower Bobra, the Hvizda (Queis). The group included the so-called Sorbs between the Saale and the Elbe (1) then the Lusatians on the middle Saale, and the Milczani on the upper Elster, the upper Spree and the Neisse. From the eleventh century on, the Germans began to penetrate into these regions; but they only came there in large numbers beginning with the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. At this period the Sorb national group began to diminish to the west of the Elbe; it finally succumbed as a result of the Thirty Years War. The situation was better in /95/ Upper and Lower Lusatia, united under the Bohemian crown. Unfortunately, in 1635 the Treaty of Prague ceded
175 the territory to the House of Saxony. The Sorbian national group
668 commenced to decline, especially in Lower Lusatia. Its decadence was not arrested until the nineteenth century by the literary renaissance which restored some energy to this small people.

Thanks to the efforts of a few patriots, the national conscience

---

1. These Sorbs are designated in Latin texts of the Middle Ages by the name Sorabes. (Translator)

^2[Wendland -- Analyst] ^1[Among the Polabian Slavs - Analyst]

1: Niederle--61 E-5 1911 E/6 Slavic Peoples E/6
Sorbs

175 [illegible] was reawakened, literature revived, the Slavic tongue was introduced into the primary schools and the Germans of Saxony granted to their Sorbian fellow-citizens a tolerable modus vivendi. How long will this state of affairs endure? It is difficult to foretell.

● 177 Germanization is making great progress especially in Lower Lusatia, subjected to Prussians.

101 162 S 17. Boundary of the National Group.---In 1886 Muka established on his ethnographic map, the best which exists up until the present, this boundary by a line which began to the south of Lubja (Lobau), passed between Rychbach (Reichenbach) and Wosporg (Weissenbach*), ran to Nizka (Niesky*), Reczice* (Rietschen*), went toward Muzakow* (Muskau*) on the Neisse, then following the Neisse reached Barsc (Forst), ran to Gresna* (Griessen*), to Barklawa* (Baerenklau*), to the west of Gubna (Guben*). The line then went straight to the west by Luboraz* (Lieberose*), Mochow*, Waldow*, Bocklin* (Burglehne*) then toward the south through Lubnjow* (Lubbenau*), /96/ through Wotrowce* (Bischofsdof*), Kalama* (Kalan*), Rudna* (Reuden*) and Bukowina; then towards the southwest the boundary ran around Komorow* (Senftenber*), Rolana* (Ruhland*) on the Elster, went through Nadzicow* towards Kamence*, Elstra*, Biskupci* (Bischofswerda*), where it turned sharply to the east towards Velecin* (Wilthen*) on the Lubia*. Such was the outer boundary of the region in which the majority of the people spoke Sorbian; there was in this region an absolutely Sorbian territory in the neighborhood of Chotebuz* (Cottbus*) and of Grodk*. There were also numerous German islands.

On the map drawn up in 1902 by A. Czerny, the territory had diminished and the Germans had gained ground. Today the northern part of Lower Lusatia is separated from the southern part only by a straight line between Grodk* and Chotebuz* on the two banks of the Spree. However, Tetzner in his book wrongly indicates Lower Lusatia as forming only an island.

161 S 18. Statistics.--The figures in effect confirm that the number of Lusatians is diminishing. At about 1880-1884, Muka, travelling from village to village, had set the total number of Sorbs at 175,966. He counted 72,000 in Lower Lusatia and 103,000 in Upper Lusatia. The official statistics for 1900 numbered only 93,032 Sorbs, speaking only Sorbian. If one adds about 23,000 bilinguals speaking both Sorbian and

161 German, one arrives at the figure of 116,810 individuals, and, if this figure is corrected according to the estimates of Parczewski, of Swjela*, and of Muka, about 156,000 persons are obtained, a lamentable total for a people surrounded and penetrated from all sides by the German ● [177] flood. What favors Germanization is the extent to which the Sorbs are economically dependent upon the Germans: the military service, preaching in German, the absence of an intellectual class, their complete isolation. The Sorbs who resist most energetically are those of Upper Lusatia, whose intellectual center is at Bautzen (Budysin). In Saxony, of 297 communes called Wends (1), according to the census of 1900, there are in all 225 with a Slav majority, and only 7 entirely Slav.

167 We have no other data on the Lusatians or on their emigration. It appears that there are colonies in America (especially in Texas--Serbin (a town), which recalls the name of the nation, Giddingswenden (probably the town of Giddings), West (perhaps the town of West Point) Yewa (not located), Warda (a town), Burleson (a county) whose inhabitants left Europe towards the middle of the last century, and who still preserve the national tradition. There are also some in Australia (at Angerspark, at Adelaide near Melbourne). They are of more recent origin.

775
162 The great majority of the Sorbs are Lutherans; there are 15,000 Catholics, who live for the most part in the neighborhood of Budysin (Bautzen).

197 /98/ S 19. Differentiation.--Even though they are only a small
182 nation, the Sorbs are not unified from the linguistic point of view. The difference between the idioms of Upper and Lower Lusatia is so great that the common people have great difficulty in understanding one another and many linguists have recognized two distinct languages. There are in fact two literary languages founded upon the two dialects which are farthest apart (that of Kottbus and that of Bautzen) and two literatures. This duality creates a grave danger, the much more so as the two fractions are divided from a political viewpoint. Kottbus belongs to Prussia and Bautzen to Saxony. Aside from the language, the
101 two Lusatian groups differ from many viewpoints in matters of domestic
182 life and costume. According to Muka, the boundary between the two

1. The Sorbs of Lusatia are called Wends in German.

S.P.C. 175 167 to the present.

Slovakia, belonging to Hungary, was not spared by the German invasion. Germanization began to penetrate into the northern portion--perhaps Slovak--the Pannonia, beginning in the ninth century, as is attested by a celebrated text of 850: Conversio Bagoiarorum et Carantanorum. In the north of Hungary, from the twelfth century, the regents during the minority of Geza II (1141-1161) called a great number of Germans into the county of Spis to act as /106/ a counterweight to the attraction which Poland was exerting upon the county of Zvolen. Following the example of these first colonists, the Germans, beginning in the thirteenth century, penetrated from the west into the counties of Bratislava and of Nitra, from the south into those of Bars and of Honta where they were not to be found before this period. This immigration increased particularly after the Tatar invasion of 1241. Hungary had been ravaged, and the kings,--notably Bela IV--called for new colonists. Thus, towards the end of the fifteenth century and in the first half of the sixteenth century, there was in Slovak territory no commune in which some German family was not established. The center and the base of German colonies aside from the towns of Spiess, was the association of mining towns with Kremnitz at their head. The sources mention in the first place Krupina, in 1238, then Banska Bystrica in 1255, and Nemecke Pravno in 1267. This state of things lasted until the close of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth centuries. Two laws promulgated by the Diet in 1563 and in 1605 put an end to the privileges of the German towns and to the Germanic intrusion. Beginning with this period the Germans in the north of Hungary were Slovakized or Magyarized in turn. (Among the towns which again became Slovak may be cited Pukanec*, Nova Bana, Bela, Lubietova* and, to a considerable extent, Stiavnica and Banska Bystrica).

S.P.C. 175 177 191 Alongside the penetration of the frontier regions /107/ in Bohemia and Moldavia there should be pointed out, the influence beginning with the thirteenth century, of the German element upon the internal economy of the country, the customs, and the language. German almost assumed the role of an official language. German inhabitants received privileges. At court, among the nobility, in the towns, the German tongue played so important a role that some patriots, like Dalimil, (1) began to fear, the ruin of the Bohemian language.

S.P.
C.
175
177
191

1. Quite a long time ago I indicated the importance of this chronicler. See my Boheme pittoresque et historique (Paris, 1867).

At the beginning of the fourteenth century matters had gone so far that at the coronation of King John in 1311 the larger part of the people sang in German and the minority in Czech.

S.P.
C.
175
668
[798]

Under Charles IV and his son Vaclav a reaction took place to the benefit of the Slavic element.[1] The nobility and the clergy took an interest in this. This evolution was crowned by the wars of the Hussites, who fought at the same time for Czech faith and Czech nationality. The Germans lost their influence in the towns or were completely driven out; the Czech language reassumed its place. Among the towns which became Slavic may be cited Zatec (Saaz), Litomerice (Leitmeritz), Usti nad Labem (Aussig), Dvur Kralove, Jaromer, Hradec Kralove, Nemecky Brod, Caslav, Kutna Hora, Pelhrimov, Susice, Budejovice, Kaplice, Stribro and Plzen, all of which were already Czech at the end of the fourteenth century.

/108/ At this time, in Bohemia, in Moravia, in Siberia, Czech became an official language. It was proclaimed to be the sole administrative language at Opava (Troppau) in 1431, at Tesin (Teschen) in 1434, in Moravia in 1480, in Bohemia in 1495. In short, in the course of the fifteenth century Bohemia and Moravia rapidly became Czech, the national consciousness grew stronger, all the more because germanization became weaker within the country and in the frontier districts. Nevertheless, this very brilliant period had no enduring results. In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries a portion of Czech territory was again germanized as a result of the introduction of Protestantism and through the efforts of the new dynasty. Then came a long period of wars and persecutions which desolated entire regions and was followed by the new influx of German colonists from Misnie*, Voigtland*, from Franconia and from the Palatinate. Thus, at the very moment when the Czech language became official within the kingdom, when the Czech literature was flourishing, a great section of Czech soil was lost.

S.P.
C.
175
177
167

S.P.
C.
[728]

Then came the defeat of Bila Hora (1620) and the unhappy events which placed the Czech nation in the hands of a dynasty which was German and absolutist. In 1627 a new organization was imposed

[1] [Against the influence of the German element upon the country - Analyst]

S.P.
C.
175
● 177
167

upon the country; German acquired an importance which it never had before. Bohemia found herself engaged in a series of wars, of miseries, of sufferings which diminished to the /109/ lowest degree the numbers and the energy of the Czech nation and rendered it a prey to the immigrants whose number increased each day. Many families which were faithfully preserving the national tradition emigrated, many perished, many changed their nationality. Immense domains were confiscated and passed into the hands of foreigners. Many of the most distinguished German Protestant families also left the country.

Thus, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the German population increased and the Germanic belt which surrounded Bohemia became wider. At this moment the Czechs lost in the north the regions of Zlutice (Luditz), of Zatec (Saaz), where, however, the Czech tongue resisted until the end of the seventeenth century, then that of Postoloptry (1) (Postelberg), Teplice (Teplitz), Usti (Aussig), Bilina, Lovosice (Lobositz), (Litomerice was not germanized until the eighteenth century), Ceska Duba, Steti, Mimon, Vartemberk*. To the northeast they lost the districts of Rokytnice, Vrchlaby, Hostinne; to the west, those of Primda, Hostoun, Pobezovice (Ronsperg), Horsova Tyna*, Straze*, Bor, Plane*, as far as Manetin. The German area, as it was described in the years 1699-1701 by the Czech pilgrim Antonin Frozin, is practically identical with the German area of today. According to the studies of Slavik, as much may be said for /109/ Moravia at the end of the seventeenth century. In the last two hundred and fifty years, however, there have been some modifications in northern Moravia. The towns of Usov*, Unczov*, Zabreh and Stity (Silperk) have been germanized.

On the other hand, the national language, and with it the national consciousness of the Czechs, disappeared more and more under the governmental pressure. The nobility, the intellectual class, the bourgeoisie gave in one by one. In the eighteenth century the patriots despaired compaired completely of the future.

In 1790 Pelcel said that in fifty years it would be difficult to find a Czech; in 1810 Dobrovsky wrote to Kopitar the famous letter: "Causa gentis nostrae, nisi Deus adjuvet, plane desperata est". /"The cause of our country is, unless God helps, quite hopeless"/. And

---

1. This name simply comes from the Latin "Apostolorum Porta." Translator.

S.P. c. 175 177 167 again in 1827 Jungmann in a moment of discouragement gave vent to this sad cry: "We have had the sad fate of being the witnesses and the accessories of the final annihilation of our mother tongue."

S.P. c. 175 668 517 Nevertheless, certain men succeeded in awakening the nation, in saving what might be saved. The history of the Czech literature since the second half of the eighteenth century shows us in an admirable fashion the work which a little group of men, obscure but impassioned, taken with a great idea, have been able to accomplish.

Aroused by the progress of liberalism in Europe, by the "Josephinism," they succeeded in reviving an interest in national affairs, in shaking the people out of their torpor, at first among the lowly ones who had preserved the language, then in the intellectual class. This Czech people, whose existence appeared doubtful one hundred years ago, of whom the Viennese educator Kindermann von Schulstein, basing himself upon the new scholastic program, had proclaimed the approaching disappearance, this Czech people, is today conscious of itself, it forms a compact mass of six and one-half million persons and constitutes an impregnable citadel against which the powerless efforts the germanism bent upon the ruin of the Slavs come and break. There is only one thing to regret and that is that political conditions have prevented the union and assimilation of the two million Slovaks settled in northern Hungary.

S.P. c. 101 S 21. National Frontiers.--The compact mass of the Czechs and Slovaks are distributed among six administrative regions: in Austria, in the Kingdom of Bohemia, the Margraviate of Moravia, and the Duchy of Silesia, in Hungary, and, for a few segments, in Prussian Silesia.

The ethnographic boundary which separates the Slovaks from the other Czechs runs across Moravia; but the Slovaks of Moravia are so closely associated with the life of the Czech nation and are drawing so much closer to them each day that one may /112/ consider as the true boundary the political frontier which separates Moravia from Hungary. There, in the Carpathians, a wall stands which separates the two groups, Czechs and Slovaks, and unless unforeseen circumstances intervene, it is to be feared that their former unity will wind up in a dualism: Czechs on the one side, Slovaks on the other.

Thanks to a series of ethnographic studies, and also to the acute

1: Niederle--78 E-5 1911 EC Slavic Peoples E/L
czechoslovakia EB1

S.P. C. 563 162 In Bohemia 50,000 Jews declared themselves to be Czechs, and in Moravia 6,792; 40,521 in Bohemia and 34,261 in Moravia declared that they were Germans. Hungary actually possesses one-tenth of the Jews of the entire world, and they are increasing more rapidly than the other national groups (14.8%). Almost all of them claim that they are Magyars.

S.P. C. ● 177 668 In studying the history and the ethnography of the Czecho-Slovaks, one sees that the Czechs began by losing much more territory than they gained. But this unfortunate situation has ceased; the national consciousness has developed; the spirit of an entire people has set up a solid barrier against the Germanic invasion. Certain losses are still inevitable, but they can be retrieved. The most threatene section is made up of the frontier of northern Moravia where the Germans today are concentrating their strength. They wish to unite their compact masses with the islands of Lanskroun, Zabreh, Olomouc and to cut Bohemia from Moravia. It is here that the Czech nation should especially think of acting and defending itself.

S.P. C. 161 Moreover, the increase of the Czechs with respect to that of the Germans is good. During the last ten years the Czechs have increased by 8.49% and the Germans only by 1.96%.

/124/ In the German region the Czechs have increased by 0.1% and in the Czech region the Germans gave decreased by 0.5%. The least favored region from a Czech viewpoint is that of Moravska Ostrava (Moehrisch Ostrau), where the Czechs are greatly decreasing.

000 It is important to reinforce the Czech element upon the frontier, to raise Czech capital in opposition to German money, to set up Czech schools as opposed to German schools, and, in order to stand against all assaults, to strengthen the national consciousness. It is necessary to build up the Czech element from an economic and physical viewpoint, to improve the general well-being, to increase the means of exchanging ideas.

In brief, the progress of the Germans upon the frontier has been so insignificant for the past century, that it will still be hundreds of years before it becomes a cause of concern.

What is much more serious is that the Czech areas are losing

1: Niederle--79 E-5 1911 EK Slavic Peoples E 16
Czechoslovakia E 81

S.P. C. 166 161 What is much more serious is that the Czech areas are losing population to the profit of the German sections. (In Moravia it is completely the contrary). In 1890 33.46% of the Czechs in Bohemia were living in German areas; in 1900 there were already 34.61% of them. During this ten year period the birth rate in the German sections was 8.1% for the Germans, and only 4.8% among the Czechs of the Czech sections. These phenomena are explained by the importance of German industry which attracts the Czechs into the German areas.

S.P. C. 148 177 Already the Germans--at least /125/ the sensible ones--recognize that it is impossible to Germanize the Czechs. The chauvinists alone still dared to hope for it, especially those who consider Bohemia as a lock which one can burst asunder in order to open to the German race an access to the Adriatic. But they are fooling themselves, as are those who believe that the Poles of the Kindom of Prussia can be denationalized.

S.P. C. 101 The situation of the Slovaks in Hungary is not nearly so good; they are deprived of all political rights and, following the example of what is happening in Prussia, they are being threatened with expropriation. Nevertheless, they continue to stand against the Magyars within their ancient boundaries, they give way only very slightly within these boundaries, and, were it not for the Magyarization which is being energetically imposed upon the nation, especially upon the upper classes, and for a rather considerable emigration, the people would be able to hold their own, all the more since they are constantly assimilating Polish and Russian elements in the north and east of their territory.

000 When in 1900 I drew up my ethnographic map for the Slovaks, the Russians protested against the figures which the statistics showed to their detriment. It has been demonstrated that the progress of the Slovaks had not been as rapid as I had thought, but it exists nevertheless. All of eastern Slovakia is nothing but Russia which has been Slovakized, and this assimilation is continuing.

S.P. C. 178 [144] /126/ S 24. Differentiation.--The primitive differentiation of the tribes has left no important trace among the Czechs. All of the shades of difference have been leveled off by time and those which relate to the physical aspects, to the languages, to costume in these latter days, have almost entirely disappeared.

S.P. Sl. 101 162 particularly to the north and to the east, numerous German islands; we have already mentioned the German group at Kocevje (Gottschee), which includes a considerable number of localities.

S.P. Sl. 162 177 Furthermore, the northern frontier, and also that which touches Hungary, are gravely threatened. In Carinthia and in Styria the Germans have taken over the official functions and the schools, and, thanks to their efforts, the number of Slovenes is diminishing considerably In Carinthia 101,050 Slovenes were reported in 1890; in 1900 the figure was reduced to 90,495 and it is to be feared that the coming generation will be completely Germanized. In Styria, in 1850, 643,194 Germans were enumerated as compared with 363,750 Slovenes; in 1900 there were 902,343 Germans against 409,521 Slovenes. Thus in a half-century the number of Germans had increased by 40.5% and that of the Slovenes only 12.5%. These figures, as we shall explain farther along, are not completely reliable. However, it is impossible to deny a serious decrease in the number of Slovenes in all the areas in which they live. Refer above in Section 23 to the table of the birth rate of Slav peoples[1] which shows 6.1% for the Slovenes in 1880, 5.23% in 1890, and only 4.65% for the year 1900.

The most threatened frontier is that of /142/ Carinthia and Styria between Arvez* and Radgona (German; Radkersburg) where the Slovenes are withdrawing constantly on the south side and are maintaining themselves only in the mountains. In Hungary they are being rapidly Magyarized, notably in the county of Zelezna (Vas). Furthermore, even in Carnolia, they are increasing very slightly, as will be indicated later.

S.P. Sl. 161 S 27. Statistics.--Along with the Sorbs of Lusatia, the Slovenes constitute the smallest Slavic people and also the most threatened one. They are strangled between the Germans, the Italians, and the Magyars, furthermore, their birth rate is almost insignificant.

In Austria the following figures were counted:

In 1880	1,140,504
In 1890	1,176,672
In 1900	1,192,780

In Hungary, in 1890, there were counted 94,992 (including

---

[1] [cf. E/6 Slavic Peoples, 1: Niederle, Category 116, pp. 75-76, foot note 1 — Analyst]

S.P. Sb. 101 make it out, starts from Stara-Moldava and passes through the villages or towns of Kroupica, Subotica, Izbiste, Aulma*, Dolova*, Dobrica, Roudna, Srpski Modosh, Srpska Boka, Srpska-Neuzina, Bokosh, Orlovat (Orlod), Perlez*, Veliki Beckerek (or Zrenjanin or Petrovgrad). Petrovgrad, Melenci, Curug, Nadal*, Turia (Torja), Sentomash, Despot, Sentivan (Szent-Ivan), Paraga*, Tovarichovo*, Deronie*, Vaiska and Sonta (Szond) on the Danube. Then it is necessary to point out a certain number of Serbian islands, especially the rather large group of the county of Torontal, to the east of Senta (Zenta), as far as Velika Kikinda, and a certain number of islands, for example that of Krasso, in the county of the same name, others in that of Timisoara, in Backa, around Sombor (Zombor), and even in the county of Budapest and, beyond the Danube, islands in the outskirts of Mohacs. Here S.P. Cr. 101 the Croatian domain begins, represented by a few islands in Magyar and German areas, between Pecs and Mohacs. The compact group of Croats starts in the south of the county of Szomod, at Stara (Sztara) on the Drava. At the beginning it forms a group of communes along the river, then another group in the county of Szalad*, where the Croat tongue is spoken to the north of the Mura, and it extends as far as Kanjiza, on the frontier of Styria.

/160/ A long chain of Croat villages stretches out in the counties of Vas, of Soprony and of Moson, between the frontier of Hungary and the middle course of the Raab, as far as the Leitha and the Danube. These villages are divided between four principal groups. The Croat S.P. Cr. [177] colonies have even crossed the Leitha and the Danube and penetrated as far as the outskirts of Pozony, as far as the lower Morava, on the banks of which a few of them have been Slovakized.

In 1900, 1,560 Croats were enumerated in this area. They descend from the colonists brought in by General Christoph Teufenbach.

The Croat boundary then runs down from Kanisza towards the south, the length of the frontier of Styria and Carniola, as far as the northeast corner of Istria, and it rejoins, by way of Podgrad (Castelnuovo), Soczergy and Rakitovicza, the Dragonja (Dragongna) River from which we started a short while ago.

S.P. Cr. Sb. 101 We find other Serb and Croat colonies outside of this compact region. In the first place many of them are found in Albanian country, notably in Old Serbia which is becoming re-Serbianized more and

S.P. Cr. Sb. 101

more, and also in Macedonia. Regarding this province, we are unable, because of the contradictory character of our information and of the brevity of this book, to furnish detailed data. Some Serbs live in the regions of Tetovo, of Kumanovo, of Skoplje.

S.P. Cr. Sb. 101 167

Aside from the Serb and Croat groups which /161/ may live in the principal cities of Europe, there are also colonies in Italy, in Russia, and in America.

S.P. Cr. 101 167

In Italy, as a result of the Turkish invasions, Croats settled in the Udine area where they became mixed with the Slovenes (see Section 28)[1] and also in the Abruzzi. There they still exist today in the district of Molise and in the province of Campobasso where there are still three villages today: Acqua Viva Colla Croce (Cruc), San Felice Slavo, Montemitro (Mundimitar). There are about 5,000 persons. Italian statistics do not count individuals, but families. The three communes which we have just named are the remains of a large Slavic area which stretched as far as the province of Chieti. These Croats are the descendants of the emigrants who came in the sixteenth century from the seacoast of Dalmatia, between Makarska and the Naretva (Narenta).

S.P. Sb. 101 167

Between the years 1750 and 1752, a great number of Serbs, discontented with the behavior of the Austrian government, migrated to Russia. They settled in the northern section of the guberniya of Kherson, in the districts of Yelizavetgrad (now Kirovograd) and of Alexandrovo, and the city of Yelizavetgrad was their principal stronghold. Founded in 1756, it was at first called Fort Saint Elisabeth. The region was named New Serbia. In the northeast of the guberniya of Ekaterinoslav, another area was called Slaviano-Serbia. It was located between the northern Don, the /162/ Bakhmut (now Artemovsk), and the Lugan. But these Serbs, whose religion was the same as that of the Russians, were completely Russianized and were not reported separately in the Russian statistics. In 1842 Safarik still showed them on his ethnographic map. Mr. Florinskii, in his recent work, estimates their number at 9,000; but he adds that they have almost entirely forgotten their original language.

S.P. Sb. 177

S.P. Cr. 167

In recent times, many Croats of Austria-Hungary have emigrated to America; American statistics confound them with the Slovenes and give, for example, for the year 1905 a total of 35,000.

[1] [cf. E16 Slavic Peoples, 1: Niederle, pp. 91-92, category 11C — Analyst]

175* turies, the Scythians thus gradually transferred their nucleus from the prairie country between the Dnieper and the Don to the middle course of the Dnieper and the steppes between the Dnieper and the Bug, endeavoring to install themselves as a ruling class in the northern sections of this area and to extend their authority still further northward. This effort was vitiated by hostile contacts with other mobile ethnic units, including the Slavs.

While the Scythians had been able to set up a well-organized and centralized state in which, as their contacts with the Greek world evolved, elements of Greek civilization were grafted upon the nomadic and oriental culture which they had brought with them from Asia, they can hardly have formed at any time a majority of the population on the south Russian steppes. They were only a ruling minority, supported and enriched by the tribute in kind exacted from the subject population whose products they exported. Even the period of the fourth and third centuries B.C., during which the Scythian state was gradually declining, marked an age of great prosperity for southern Russia, since the demand for Scythian merchandise was stimulated by the influx of wealth into the Greek world after the conquests of Alexander the Great and the rise of the Hellenistic succession states.

175* 177 Though racially related to the Scythians, the Sarmatians lacked their talent for organization, and first appear as a complex of disunited tribes pushed into the steppes by Mongolian movements of the fourth to the second centuries B.C. Their advance guard had penetrated as far as the Bug and the Dniester by the end of the second century. In fact, at the beginning of our era, the Sarmatians were already a menace to the Roman Empire, and their chief element, the Alans, persisted as a dominant force in South Russia till the third century A.D. Such Scythian remnants as remained in this area were absorbed by the new masters, who imitated the Scythian policy of encouraging the commerce of the Greek coastal cities whose culture they emulated. The political evolution of these Iranian

175* residents is, however, less important than the fact that during
177 their early history the Slavs were at least in peripheral contact with Iranian elements which had a high degree of native or acquired civilization. While their influence is reflected in a few items of the Old Slavonic vocabulary, this factor is not *per se* so significant as the continuity of cultural tradition on the southeastern border of the proto-Slavic habitat.

From their neighbors to the northeast the Slavs could derive even less intellectual stimulus. The regions east of the upper Dnieper and northward from the Dvina to the Baltic were occupied by Finnish tribes until, at the beginning of the Christian era, the Slavs, by their northeasterly advance toward the Oka and the Volga, drove a wedge between the Finnish peoples, dividing them into two sections, one of which included the Mordvinians, Cheremisses, and kindred tribes of the Volga basin west of Kazan, while the other comprised the Finnish elements which gradually approached the Baltic in the triangle between the rivers Dvina and Lovat or inhabited the region of the great lakes east of the Finnish Gulf.

It has already been mentioned that the primitive habitat of the Slavs as a whole extended as far west as the middle Vistula. As in modern times, this stream was a line of immemorial contact between Slav and German as far back as even our fragmentary historical knowledge extends. Collisions between German and Slav begin in early classical times, collisions which were usually the result of German migratory movements. The earliest on record was thus caused by the movement of the Bastarnae, who, accompanied by the Sciri, another Germanic tribe, at some epoch between the time of Herodotus (the middle of the fifth century B.C.) and 240-230 B.C., moved from their seats on the lower Vistula, hence west of the Slavs, across the western Bug (now in Polish territory) through Volhynia and Podolia, occupied by Slavs, toward the Black Sea. It is thus likely that the earliest German influences were exerted upon the Slavs by this tribe.

175* After the migration of the Bastarnae, the Baltic coast of east-

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

ern Germany was settled by other Germanic peoples, especially 175*
the Goths, who were present on the shoreline as early as the fourth century B.C. At any rate, in the first two Christian centuries, we find them definitely on the lower Vistula north of the Slavs. During the second century A.D. some migratory disturbance, or perhaps even the casual exploration of watercourses followed by a desire for more fertile territory and for commercial relations with the Black Sea littoral once a route thither was discovered, induced a considerable number of the Goths to move out eastward across the Bug to the basins of the Pripet and the Dniester. At some point during this movement, perhaps in Volhynia, one section split off from the main Gothic body and, after passing down the Dniester, subsequently appeared in Dacia as the Visigoths, who fought against Caracalla's troops in 214 and crossed the Danube in 248. According to the tradition preserved by Jordanes, the rest passed over the Dnieper and finally reached the coasts of the Black Sea and the Crimea.

Since the Goths remained masters of the western steppe 175*
country from the second century A.D. until 370, when they 177
were overthrown by the Huns, they were thus the Germanic 197
tribe with whom the proto-Slavs had the closest and most lasting relations, reflected in a considerable number of loan words in the common Slavic vocabulary. These words may be classified in groups which clearly demonstrate along what lines Gothic influence upon the Slavs was most incisive. They include an extensive list of military terms (armed band, helmet, armor, sword), commercial words (usury, debt, earring, purse, buy, kettle, plate, sack, camel, vinegar, glass), agricultural items (plow, stall, vineyard, cattle, garden, donkey, fig, bread), and names of learned professions (doctor, scribe). Some of these words point also to the probability that this borrowing either did not take place until, or at any rate was still taking place during, the period when the Germans were in close contact with the Roman Empire and had themselves already borrowed some terminology from the Latin. In any event, these words

175* must have become ingrained in the Slavic vocabulary before
●177 400 A.D., and made their entry into the common speech prior
197 to the spread of the Southern Slavs into the Balkans, which
began about a century later.

175* While for 200 years the Goths were the dominant ethnic element in southern and western Russia, they constituted only a numerically inferior ruling class which controlled the Slavic natives and such Iranian elements as were left from the period of Scythian and Sarmatian supremacy. It would otherwise be difficult to explain the process by which the Goths disappeared completely from the steppe country during the two centuries after the overthrow of the Gothic kingdom by the Huns in 370. The Huns themselves were a Turko-Tartar tribe whose western movement, begun in the first century A.D. after 300 years of strife with the Chinese in southern Mongolia, brought them to the Caspian Sea in the second. They were a nonagricultural nomadic people possessed of little culture of their own. What civilization they exhibited, and particularly their military organization, they borrowed from their Sarmatian vassals. Some of the Ostrogoths joined the advancing Huns. That portion of the Gothic population which had settled in the Crimea, though also subjected to the Huns, disappeared more slowly, and some small remnants preserved their Gothic identity as late as the eighteenth century. While the authority of the Huns does not appear to have been oppressively exercised in the steppe country, it nevertheless dealt a fatal blow to the flourishing civilization composed of combined Oriental and Greek elements which had adorned the north shore of the Black Sea for nearly a millennium. The Huns were the last Asiatic people to impinge upon the eastern section of the Slavs before their dispersion and expansion.

613 The primitive social organization of the early Slavs is, it must be admitted, a highly controversial subject. An exclusively patriarchal and tribal organization is found, after all, only among purely nomadic peoples, but is immediately re-

619 presence of a patronymic suffix in early Russian tribal names
621 indicates that these tribes actually passed through a stage when
membership depended on kinship, but the attachment of the
same suffix to place names also implies that the original implication
had been forgotten before the historical period.

567 Prior to the evolution first of a commercial and subsequently
565 of an official ruling class, the primitive Slavic population was
divided into three distinguishable strata. At the lowest point in the scale stood the slaves, composed of captives taken in war, men who had lost their freedom for debt, and descendants of slave parents. At least in their early history, the attitude of the Slavs toward their slaves was exceedingly mild. Above the slaves stood the great group of freemen, governed by the elders of their communities and later by tribal chieftains supported by a council of elders.

581 Polygamy and concubinage were common to all primitive
595 Slavs. In spite of the evidence for considerable promiscuity, a
sense of the sanctity of marriage as a permanent tie is also
demonstrated by early accounts of pagan Slavic wives who
committed suicide upon the death of their husbands, so that
the fidelity of the Slavic women was almost universally commented
on with favor by foreign observers. Survivals of primitive
custom among the Russian peasantry down to modern
times indicate nevertheless that great freedom was allowed
462 both sexes prior to marriage. The Slavic women enjoyed no
equality in the household, though a surviving widow was authorized
to take her husband's place as head of the family.
583 Marriage by capture or by purchase was common Slavic practice.

177 In the course of their history, even before the dispersion, the
326 Slavs were exposed to a series of foreign influences, especially
Iranian and Germanic, which rapidly placed at their service the techniques common to adjacent ethnic groups. Linguistic evidence demonstrates that the mass of the Slavs, like the German and the Baltic peoples, was familiar with iron, gold, silver, and lead from the earliest times, at least from the second half

of the first millennium B.C. The names for gold and silver are 177
identical in all three linguistic branches, while those for iron 326
and lead are common to both Baltic and Slavic, though differing from the German vocable. The common Slavic term for copper has no equivalent cognate in either Baltic or Germanic. Since iron became known on the coast of the Black Sea about 900 B.C., and appears in archaeological finds from the Kuban district of the northern Caucasus fully two centuries before that date, the early transmission of iron technique to the Slavs is beyond question, particularly in view of traces of iron mining and smelting in Poland even in the pre-Roman epoch. The smelting of silver and gold was, however, a post-dispersion development.

In ceramics as in metal working, the Slavs were imitators 177
rather than pioneers. In all areas of pagan Slavic settlement 323
we find well-turned and well-fired vases in the form of pots without handles, showing a somewhat flattened lip and ornamented, sometimes with a wavy line several times repeated, sometimes with simple horizontal stripes, and occasionally with vertical or transverse stripes or simply a series of dots in oblique lines. There is, however, nothing specifically Slavic about this technique, since it is a reproduction of the Roman vase with undulating ornament familiar in the northernmost Roman provinces between Danube and Rhine from the first to the fourth century A.D. The Slavs thus seem to have been in [439]
contact with the northern Roman markets in this interval, and gradually to have adopted the new type of pottery in preference to their own previous products of this character: high vases, or lower bowls without a flattened edge and decorated with horizontal stripes or rows of oblique lines, types developed independently of Roman influence.

Among the chief domestic industries were spinning and weav- 286
ing. Since the primitive Slavs were far from expert bleachers, 176
the resulting fabrics were mostly grayish in color. Not only is the general terminology as spinning and weaving throughout the Slavonic languages so homogeneous as to show that these

291 of light material or else of coarse wool, in which case it could
be worn over the shirt, and it was usually buckled or pinned at
the shoulder or in front of the neck. In cold weather sheepskins
or the cheaper pelts (bear, wolf) were worn for warmth.
Women of the people were clad in a long shirt of rough linen
or hempen fabric, often representing a mere cylinder held up
by straps over the shoulders. From the waist down they also
wore a double apron attached to a belt, while the upper part
of the body might be encased in a coarse woolen jacket, along
with a cloak of similar material around the neck and shoulders.
Footwear consisted of rough leather slippers held by a thong
over the ankle or of slippers made of bast fiber. Men frequently
302 wore wrapped leggings. Married women might wear a kerchief
or bonnet on their heads over hair cut short, but maidens
habitually went bareheaded, wearing their hair long and
braided. Men also wore their hair long in the primitive period.
● [177] Close shearing and shaving, where they occur, are due to foreign
influences, and in general it may be said that in matters of
attire the Slavs were always prompt to adopt foreign usages.

411 Originally a peaceful race, the primitive Slavs were unskilled
721 in the use of weapons. When they were first noticed by foreign
writers they had no offensive equipment except bows and
spears, and were unprotected by even the most elementary
shields. It has already been noted that in the Slavic vocabulary
the words for helmet and sword were taken over from the
Goths. In the succeeding centuries, the constant warfare of
the migratory epoch and the necessity of defense against successive
nomad incursions produced a marked amplification of
Slavic military equipment representing a fusion of borrowed
alien techniques so that when the southern Slavs invaded
Greece at the end of the sixth century, their soldier was considered
to be as good a fighter as the Byzantine regular. The
Slavs, however, used no mounted troops until well into the
historical period.

439 The Slavs were drawn very early into the orbit of European
443 commerce, which in the peripheral areas of European antiq-

167 steppes to the Danube, they threatened the Greek peninsula,
174 where their first occupation dates from 581.

721 Contemporary chroniclers report that the Slavs had by that
167 time acquired wealth by pillage and fought even better than the regular Greek troops. On the Adriatic, they occupied the districts of Illyria, Dalmatia, and Istria early in the seventh century. Shortly afterward the Slavs on the western front (the Czechs and those on the Adriatic seaboard) overthrew the Avar hegemony and became independent, but after the Avars were thus weakened, the Slavs never menaced Constantinople again. Yet by the end of the seventh century the whole interior of the Balkan peninsula, especially Macedonia and its neighborhood, was populated by Slavs. They even took to the sea and reached Crete in 623. At the height of the Avar expansion, the Slavs had already passed through Thessaly, Epirus, and Attica, and reached the Peloponnese in 588. Here their occupation was so formidable that, for the next two centuries, a Byzantine Greek scarcely dared set foot in the southern portion of the peninsula, while in the north the Danube was never again fixed as the frontier of the Byzantine Empire after 601. On the other hand, it is not to be supposed that the Slavs were ever in the majority in Greece proper. Subject Greeks still formed the mass of the population. Were this not the case, it would be difficult to explain the eventual and rather rapid subsequent disappearance of the Slavic element south of Macedonia.

101 Once the Slavs were firmly established in the Balkans, they
177 immediately became exposed to the older cultures they found there. Those on the Adriatic coast and in the western Danube basin felt the impact of Latin civilization transmitted through romanized native populations, through colonial centers, or through the cities of the seaboard. When they settled within the sphere of Greek influence, the dominant cultural pressure was Byzantine. The results of these accidents of location are still discernible in the intellectual orientation of the Balkan Slavs.

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

The Slavs were curiously tenacious in retaining their own 197
language, but extremely receptive to manners and techniques 177
transmitted to them through contact with superior cultures.
When they were present in a majority, they experienced no difficulty in impressing their language on the indigenous minority, whom they Slavicized rapidly by intermarriage. The Dalmatian coast from Veglia to Ragusa experienced this evolution from the ninth to the last century. On the other hand, remnants of the old Romanized pre-Slavic population, known as Vlakhs, persist in the interior of the peninsula to the present day, especially in southern Macedonia and the Pindus, while the Romanians, in spite of Slavic and Turko-Tartar admixture, are a concentrate of Romanized pre-Slavic native elements. Of the indigenous and un-Romanized population prior to the migrations, the Thracians in the eastern half of the peninsula disappeared altogether, while the Illyrians in the western half survive fractionally as the Albanians. The linguistic differences between Serbian and Bulgarian have sometimes been explained by the existence of an Illyrian substratum in the former, and a Thracian in the latter, since the areas occupied by the new vernaculars correspond roughly to the regions occupied by these two pre-Slavic elements. Of the migrant tribes who preceded the Slavs into the Balkans no trace remains. The Celts had passed from the scene before the Slavs arrived. The Sarmatians, driven into the Balkans from the steppes, were known as early as the fourth century only by scanty place names. A few Germanic islands kept their names until the fifth century. The Huns rapidly dissolved after Attila's death, while the Avars, after the Slavs threw off their yoke, were decimated by their wars with Charlemagne before the year 800, and the remnant was absorbed by the adjacent Slavs.

Though we find in the Balkans an uninterrupted set of 197
Slavic dialects gradually shading into each other, from the [2/2]
Adriatic to the Black Sea, the three basic literary languages
(Slovenian, Serbo-Croatian, and Bulgarian) are well-differen- 167
tiated vernaculars. It is not to be supposed, however, that this

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

though in their migrations they left important remnants in 167
Silesia and the Riesengebirge which made their presence felt in local place names before they were assimilated by other Slavic elements of these areas. On the other hand, materials dealing with the early existence of the Serbo-Croats on the Balkan peninsula are strikingly scanty. Both assume historical importance only in the ninth century, when the Serbs collided with the Bulgars and the Croats with other Slavs and with Franks in the middle Danube basin.

The destiny of the Slavs in modern Bulgaria was subject to 167
influences differing radically from that of their kindred in the 177
western Balkans. The territory which they had occupied in the sixth century was traversed several times during the seventh century by a nation of Turko-Tartar invaders known as the Bulgars, who had come into the Balkans from across the steppe country, but at first retired behind the Danube after each of their incursions southward. About 670, however, when other powerful Turkic elements began to occupy the south Russian prairies and coastline, they were obliged to seek a residence in the Danube delta and south of it. They thus settled down in Moesia, the flat country between the Danube and the chains of mountains further south. During this process, they seem to have arrived without difficulty at an understanding with the Slavic residents, whose local princes became subject to the Bulgar khan. But here, as elsewhere, it was the invaders who were culturally assimilated. The Bulgars abandoned their own idiom for Slavic, and while Bulgars and Slavs were still differentiated in this area during the eighth century, they were viewed as identical in the ninth. It is thus clear that numerically the Slavs in Moesia must have been more numerous than the energetic and warlike Bulgars whose name they adopted. The new Bulgarian state rapidly expanded its influence to include Macedonia even down to Salonika and the Aegean coast.

The Slavic flood which overwhelmed the Greek peninsula in the last twenty years of the sixth century lasted until about

/67
/77

800, but in the next two hundred years Byzantine authority was gradually reëstablished throughout Hellas proper. By the twelfth century, in fact, there were but scattered Slavic remnants to be found south of Epirus and Thessaly. Though place names still yield abundant traces of this Slavic occupation, historians have long since disproved the famous thesis of Fallmerayer that the race of the ancient Greeks had been annihilated in Europe. As a matter of fact, as soon as Byzantine supremacy was restored, what Slavs there were throughout the countryside became assimilated so fast that they disappeared altogether. In Macedonia, on the other hand, though Greek civilization tended to recover and even to dominate as time progressed, the local Slavs were still numerous enough to preserve their ethnic and linguistic identity. In Hellas, however, the native Greek element was too populous and the Slavic colonists too few to make such a survival possible. Somewhat the same situation prevailed further north in Transylvania and Walachia, where the Slavic settlers eventually faded out under Romanian pressure.

While the problems connected with the migrations and the settlement of the Southern Slavs are relatively simple, if we except the alien influences affecting the Bulgarians and the decline of Slavic domination in Hellas, the destinies of the Western Slavs are, for a variety of reasons, infinitely more complex. At the beginning of the Christian era the whole expanse of northern Europe from the Rhine to the Vistula and from the Baltic, first to the Sudetens and later to the Danube, was occupied by Germanic tribes. From the second to the fifth centuries, certain important Germanic units moved out of the basins of the Elbe, the Oder, and their confluents, so that by the fourth century eastern Germany was almost totally evacuated by its Germanic inhabitants. Though German savants have been traditionally loth to admit that there were any Slavs in this area during the first period of German settlement, there are a number of tribal names which the classical historians for lack of accurate knowledge bulked with the Germans,

but which justify the hypothesis that there were at least some /67
Slavic elements west of the Vistula in classical premigration /77
times. Hence, the westward Slavic drift very likely began sometime before the Slavs actually appear on the Oder and the Elbe in the fifth century A.D.

Even with the Germanic tribes present, the area was sparsely enough settled, and it is illogical to suppose that this district was totally denuded of human habitation when they left to pursue their destinies elsewhere. Archaeologically, Germanic civilization comes to an abrupt halt in eastern Germany during the fourth century. Furthermore since the proto-Slavs had a chance to adopt the types of Roman provincial pottery, they must have begun to spread toward the Roman outposts before that date. It would, on the other hand, take us too far afield to belabor the point whether or not the Slavs were in German territory before the Germans descended from Scandinavia. We may thus limit ourselves to the admission that there were some Slavic elements in eastern Germany west of the Vistula even when this area was under German occupation before the migrations began, and the Slavs may well have been the *superiores barbari* who, according to Julius Capitolinus, set so many Germanic tribes in motion during the reign of Marcus Aurelius.

But even if we thus suppose that the Slavs crossed the Vistula before 150 A.D., their occupation of Germany to the Elbe and the Oder is not historically confirmed until early in the sixth century. In 512 Procopius mentions that the Germanic Heruli, after defeat by the Lombards, made their way north to Denmark "through all the nations of the Sclaveni," and the Elbe and the Saale are elsewhere mentioned at the same period as the frontier between German and Slav. Apprehensive of Slavic penetration west of this line, Charlemagne in 805 fixed the Slavic boundary, the *limes sorabicus*, running roughly northward from Regensburg to the Saale and from the vicinity of Magdeburg northwestward across country to the estuary of the Elbe and the site of modern Hamburg. The border was later continued on a line roughly connecting the sites of Hamburg than 1167, and long before that date the process of extermination or assimilation had set in. 177

In view of the latest developments in modern history, let us pause a moment on the origins of the Czechoslovaks. The primeval habitat of Czechs and Slovaks was located north of the Carpathians between the headwaters of the Oder and the middle Vistula. The Czechs reached Bohemia and Moravia by the upper reaches of the Neisse and Oder and westward through the Sudeten range and between the Gesenke and the Jablunka. The Slovaks, on the other hand, arrived in their present location between the Morava and the Danube by passing the western Carpathians (that is, the Beskids and the High Tatra south of modern Krakow). The western limits of the Czechs were thus the Böhmer Wald and the Erzgebirge, while on the north they enjoyed a good natural frontier in the mountains from the Sudetens to the Carpathians. On the south the Bohemians and Moravians originally extended to the Danube, but were gradually pushed back along the river between Linz and Vienna until the twelfth century, though the Slovaks maintained contact with it at Bratislava (Pressburg). The western Slovak limit is still roughly the river Morava, which joins the Danube about thirty miles east of Vienna. 167

There is no longer much question but that the Czech and the Slovak languages were originally an identical dialect just as their speakers were primitively one group, but even in modern times there is an appreciable diversity of dialect, culture, and character among various sections of even the Czechs themselves, and the present differentiation of the Slovaks was conditioned and intensified by geographical separation from the Czechs and by the long-standing political dominance of the Magyars since 1029. The intellectual gap between Czech and Slovak is also due to the rapid Czech assimilation of German culture. Finally, at the extreme east end of the state of Czechoslovakia is an area known as Subcarpathian Russia. Its inhabitants speak a Ukrainian (Little Russian) dialect per- 197 184

destined to develop the Khazar state. The advance of the 167
Khazars inspired a wide dispersion of the Bulgars. One branch 721
recrossed the Don and, continuing northward, eventually settled near the junction of the Volga and the Kama, where they appear in later Russian history. The other section moved westward and, after uniting with their tribal kinsmen who had preceded them into the Balkans, carried their standards to Salonika in 675 before they settled in Moesia and fused with the South Slavs already resident there. But the Khazars remained in the steppe country, and gradually spread out across the prairies until they reached the southern Bug.

From such indications as we have that the Eastern Slavs had 167
penetrated as far east as the Sea of Azov in the sixth century, 177
their contacts with the various waves of mobile Asiatic invaders must have been closer than the scanty data of extant sources record though, in view of the infinitely small number of Turko-Tartar loan words which found their way into the Slavic vocabulary prior to the recorded history of the Slavs, it is evident that this contact was productive of little intellectual influence on the Slavs themselves. In fact, thanks to their association with Iranian and Goth, the Eastern Slavs had attained a degree of civilization at least equal and probably superior to that of the series of Turko-Tartar nomads who traversed southern Russia between the fourth and the seventh centuries.

During this interval, in any case, the steppes between the 167
Don and the Dnieper were the scene of constant shifts of population. Fleeing before the Huns, the Goths had moved back into central Europe. Driven by the Avars, the western Bulgars had pushed forward into the Balkans. The Avars themselves were ultimately demolished by combined Frank, Slav, and Bulgar offensives along the Danube, and the eastern Bulgar units were displaced by the Khazars. The period of Khazar expansion westward was thus an epoch peculiarly favorable for the progress of the Eastern Slavs down the valleys of the Dnieper and the Dniester. Traces of this colonization are preserved in the *Primary Chronicle,* which places the Slavic Uli-

Like the Scythian and Sarmatian kingdoms of which it was the functional successor, the Khazar state rested upon a fusion of agrarian and commercial interests. Its nominal ruler was the *khan* (*Khakan*), who was substantially a religious figurehead. The actual administration was in the hands of the *beg*, who commanded the standing army composed chiefly of mercenaries of Khwarizmian, Slavic, and later even of Scandinavian extraction. The Khazar capital was situated at Itil, near the site of modern Astrakhan, and in the eighth and ninth centuries Khazaria was hardly of less importance to Byzantine foreign policy than the Carolingian Empire. The Khazar domination over their northern tributaries was, however, loosely organized, and the small Khazar standing army was incapable of serious offensive operations, a weakness doubly menacing in view of the fact that the series of nomadic incursions from the plains of Asia was as yet unfinished. About 860 the Khazar state was shaken by the fierce inroads of a new Turko-Tartar tribe, the Pechenegs, who had previously dwelt between the Volga and the Yaik until set in motion by the pressure of other kindred peoples behind them. The Pechenegs drove the Magyars across the Dnieper and on into central Europe, caused a concentration of the Eastern Slavs on the middle Dnieper, and aroused such apprehension among the Khazars that the latter, to protect their interests in the steppe country, sought the aid of Byzantine engineers to construct the new fortress of Sarkel on the lower Don. From this point dates the decline of the Khazar state, which was also hastened by influences emanating from the specifically Slavic areas of the Dnieper valley. In fact the decline of Khazaria stimulated the evolution of the Kiev principate, the economic development of which stamps it as the logical heir of the Khazar polity.

The influence of the Khazars on the culture of the Eastern /77
Slavs at the dawn of their history is greater than usually appreciated, since the Khazar dominance extended over a period of some two centuries and was the bearer of a relatively advanced civilization. In view of the fact that the Khazars are

177 known to have kept a garrison at Kiev, it is even probable that the name of that city is of Khazar origin, that is, *küi*, "bank of a river," and *ev*, "settlement," which well accords with the lower part of the city as it still is today.

000 On the north and the east, the Eastern Slavs were eventually
confronted by Finnish tribes. We have relatively little data
on the primitive habitat of the Finns, but modern scholarship
places it in the extreme eastern section of northern Europe, on
the edge of the Ural mountains and even further eastward.
They were thus concentrated from earliest times in the basins of
the rivers Oka, the Kama, and the middle Volga, and it is from
this nucleus that they spread westward to the Finnish Gulf,
occupying not only Karelia and modern Finland, but also the
southern shore as far as the Gulf of Riga, hence modern
Esthonia and much of present-day Latvia. In central Russia
their line of settlement extended as far west as modern Moscow,
where they were in touch with an original Lithuanian popula-
167 tion which has long since disappeared. Indeed, since these
Lithuanian elements occupied a line running from the Baltic
177 to the neighborhood of modern Smolensk and Kaluga, the
actual contacts of Eastern Slavs and Finns cannot have begun
until the Slavs themselves had already crossed the northern
Dnieper and advanced toward the head of the Desna, and until
the Finns themselves had begun to move westward toward the
[197] Baltic. This view is confirmed by the fact that it is only in the
extreme north and east of the Russian area that Finnish lin-
guistic influences are perceptible.

000 While there are some tribes known to Herodotus who may
have been Finns, the Finns themselves are first mentioned with
certainty by Tacitus, who did not think very highly of them,
since he speaks of their remarkable ferocity at once with their
sordid poverty, adding that they lived on herbs, dressed in
skins, slept on the ground, and defended themselves with bone-
tipped arrows. Jordanes, the Gothic historian, knew some
177 identifiably Finnish tribes as subjects of the Goths. Our now
familiar source, the Russian *Primary Chronicle*, composed after

the expansion of the Eastern Slavs was an accomplished fact, /77 shows them in contact with the Finns on a long line from the Baltic to the upper Don. The chronicler distinguishes three groups of Finns: those on the Baltic, those beyond the upper Volga, and those on the middle Volga itself. The Finnish tribes south of Moscow and between Moscow and the Volga have disappeared, though the other groups are still abundantly represented even today.

Whenever the Eastern Slavs encountered the Finns, the latter either retired or remained passive. Though the Finns may have been bellicose in Tacitus's day, Jordanes knew them only as *mitissimi*—extremely pacific. In these early days the Finns showed no tendency toward urban concentration or to union for defense, while the Slavs, during the period in which [721] their greatest expansion at Finnish expense took place (the ninth and tenth centuries), were already profiting by the military technique and leadership of courageous and enterprising Viking immigrants from Scandinavia.

At this date but one people of Finnish stock undertook an energetic offensive with perceptible historical results. These were the Magyars, who had already been in contact with Turko-Tartar tribes and had thus acquired some warlike talents. The Magyars are related to certain still extant Finnish tribes (the Voguls and the Ostyaks) on the river Ob in Siberia. After splitting off from the ethnic nucleus in about the seventh century, they moved west into southern Russia, where they met the Khazars on the Don. Then, around 860, they pushed on into Moldavia, and finally, after various raids into Pannonia and the Balkans, settled down in the Hungarian plain, where their descendants have lived since about the year 900. Their subsequent contacts were thus largely with the Southern and the Western Slavs.

None of these Finnish tribes have any ethnic or linguistic /77 relationship with the Slavic tribes. But with the Lithuanians the situation is somewhat different. The Lithuanians are an Indo-European people, and their language shows affinity with

177 174 Slavonic, although the two idioms have undergone widely variant evolutions over a long period. It is generally held by competent scholars that there was at some early date an epoch of Balto-Slavic unity. Precisely when this unity existed it is not so easy to say. The facts that certain Iranian words appear in Slavic without a counterpart in Lithuanian, and that the Balts borrowed other words from Finnish which the Slavs do not possess, have given rise to the theory that the Balts and the Slavs had separated before the arrival of the Scythians and even early in the bronze age, hence before 1000 B.C. But these are very tenuous proofs, and the most we can say with certainty is that the Balts and the Slavs had been separated for a long time before history knew either of them.

177 The modern extent of Lithuanian (Baltic) territory in Lithuania, Latvia, and their environs is, moreover, much more limited than it was in an earlier age, for before the westward migration of the Finns from the Volga, the Letto-Lithuanian people occupied the Baltic coast from the Vistula to the Gulf of Finland and the interior across White Russia (Byelorussia) to the western limit of the Finns between the upper Volga and Moscow rivers north of the line of settlement of the early Eastern Slavs. There were Lithuanian survivals, a tribe known as the Galindians, near Moscow as late as the thirteenth century, showing that Slavic colonization in central Russia encountered not only Finns, but also Balts. The Russian *Primary Chronicle* thus knows not only the Galindians, but also the Prussians on the coast east of the Vistula, and the Lithuanians (a specific tribal name) and other Baltic units around the Gulf of Riga where the Letts now reside. It should be noted that the German Prussians derive their name from the old home of the Lithuanian Prussians, that is, modern East Prussia, the country south of Danzig and Königsberg. This area was subjugated by the Teutonic knights during the thirteenth century, after which the eradication of the original Baltic inhabitants proceeded so rapidly that the language had died out by the year 1700.

It was necessary to dwell at some length on the contacts of /67
the Eastern Slavs because the area which they inhabit is, after /77
all, fairly remote, and the process by which they came to occupy it is likewise far from the ken of any but the specialist. As the Eastern Slavs branched out into the steppes toward the Black Sea and the Don and northeastward at the expense of Lithuanian and Finnish tribes, the old unity tended to relax in proportion to their dispersion. New centers of population formed at considerable distances from the old foci. The colonizers underwent new influences which varied with their locations. The southeastern settlers experienced Khazar influence, the northern colonies were close to Scandinavia of the Viking age, and the Slavs along the lower Dnieper were within the cultural sphere of Byzantium.

The Arabic geographers who described eastern Europe of the ninth century already noted four centers of Eastern Slavic concentration at that early period: one near Lake Ilmen, another on the Oka River near the city of Ryazan, one at Kiev, and a fourth in Galicia, and more detailed tribal designations among the Eastern Slavs were likewise known to both German and Greek sources of the same period. Finally, the oft-cited Russian *Primary Chronicle* preserves from traditions considerably earlier than the twelfth century not only a list of tribes on Russian soil, but also their locations. These tribes are the Croats, the Polyane, the Volhynians, the Dulebians, the Buzhane, the Dregovichians, the Polotians, the Novgorod Slavs, the Severians, the Krivichians, the Radimichians, the Vyatichians, the Ulichians, and the Tivercians.

The Croats mentioned were a remnant of the tribe of the same name which remained behind in eastern Galicia, Bukovina, and on the Prut and the Dniester rivers after others of their kindred had moved on into the Balkans. The Dulebians, the Volhynians, and the Buzhane (who are connected by their name with the river Bug in Volhynia) inhabited Volhynia in the neighborhood of modern Lutsk. The Derevlians (whose name is connected with Slavic *derevo,* "wood"), occupied the

/67 vast forests south of the Pripet River, and were, on account of their remote location, culturally backward.

●/77 In this respect, they contrast with their eastern neighbors, the Polyane, who lived in the prairie country (their name characterizes them as plain dwellers) on the west bank of the Dnieper north and south of the ancient city of Kiev, which had been a point of settlement since far back into the stone age. It is not unlikely that the metropolis mentioned by the geographer Ptolemy in the second century and the *Danparstathir* of Gothic tradition and the Norse *Hervdrarsdga* were settlements on the site of modern Kiev. Situated on a strategic trade route, the Polyane were exposed to the stimulating influences of both Scandinavian and Byzantine culture as the power of the Khazars waned. It is thus by no means accidental that their chief center became the nucleus toward which adjacent tribes gravitated and that center from which foreign culture radiated throughout the entire period before it was sacked by the Tartars in 1240.

The Ulichians and the Tivercians, the ancestors of the present inhabitants of Subcarpathian Russia, present a more complicated problem. According to the *Primary Chronicle,* they lived on the southern Bug and the Dniester, extending down to the Black Sea coast and as far as the Danube. They [721] are without question the Eastern Slavic tribes which progressed the farthest toward the sea but, because of that same fact, they also occupied a position critically exposed to repeated nomad attacks. They can therefore hardly have moved south until after the departure of the Avars in the sixth century, and they were seriously menaced again by the incursion of the Magyars in the ninth century. We know from Arabic sources that the Magyars even enslaved much of the Slavic population in this area. Then, in the early tenth century, nomad incursions so increased in intensity and frequency that peaceful habitation in the coastal area eventually became impossible. The Ulichians and the Tivercians thus withdrew to the Carpathians and provided an important center of Slavic settlement in Transylvania and northern Hungary. This settlement did not take place, however, until after the tenth century, so that the Subcarpathian Russians actually did not come to occupy their present seats until some five hundred years after the dispersion of the proto-Slavs. There are, indeed, numerous place names even in the interior of Hungary which, by their Slavic origin, bear witness to the movement of these tribes. /167 /177

The easternmost of the East Slavic tribes on Russian soil were the Severians. Though placed by the *Primary Chronicle* on the Desna and its eastern tributaries, they seem to have constituted the Slavic element which pushed as far east as the Don river in the sixth century and are even located by ninth-century Arab geographers on the lower Volga and in the northern Caucasus. But, like the Ulichians and the Tivercians, they too were exposed to Turko-Tartar impacts which drove them back to the region between modern Kursk, in the north-central Ukraine, and the left bank of the Dnieper. Their chief [361] cities were Chernigov, on the Desna, and Pereslavl, southeast of Kiev on the left bank of the Dnieper.

North of the Derevlians, between the Pripet and the Dvina and as far east as the Berezina, lived the Dregovichians. Their area of occupation corresponds fairly closely to the modern White-Russian (Byelorussian) district, and thus would border on the zone of Lithuanian occupation. In fact, they are the Slavic group responsible for the contraction of this zone, since they pushed the Lithuanians back toward the Baltic coast and settled the basins of the Dvina and the Niemen rivers. Their [361] chief cities were Turov, on the Pripet, and Pinsk, east of modern Brest-Litovsk. While their tribal appellation has been quite naturally connected with a word for marsh, it is, because of its termination *-ich,* more likely a patronymic.

To the east of the Berezina and straddling the Dnieper, the Radimichians were an unimportant and backward tribe which fell comparatively early under the sway of Kiev. Further east, even as far as the Oka River and modern Moscow, and thus on the edge of the eastern Finns, lived the Vyatichians, who were

167 early colonizers in territory originally Finnish. The same ob-
177 servation applies to the Slovenes or Novgorod Slavs about Lake
Ilmen, who thus approach the region of the great lakes. Just
why they alone preserved the ethnic name of the Slavs remains
an enigma. At any rate, they were, with the Polyane of Kiev,
[224] the most progressive of the Eastern Slavs. Located in an area
[439] ill-fitted for agriculture, they lived by hunting and trapping,
by which they acquired material for barter with Scandinavian
traders. Their pioneering spirit gradually carried them still
further north toward Lakes Ladoga and Onega, and since only
a short portage separated them from the upper Volga, we
eventually find them pushing southeastward to insure a food
supply from the grain fields of the Moscow district. They
[361] founded the city of Novgorod where the Volkhov flows out of
Lake Ilmen, and economic and political collisions between
this city and Moscow were a familiar feature of later medieval
Russian history until the Muscovites emerged as victors.

Just south of the Slovenes lived the Krivichians, who domi-
nated the headwaters of the Dvina, Dnieper, and Volga rivers
and extended northwest until they collided with the Balts and
[361] Finns in the neighborhood of modern Pskov. Their chief
centers, both of which owed their importance to river traffic,
were Polotzk on the Dvina and Smolensk on the upper Dnieper.
Since Smolensk is situated at an easy portage point between
the Dvina, Lovat, and Dnieper rivers, it was one of the earliest
points of Scandinavian settlement in the interior of Russia.

361 It stands to reason that, at the dawn of Russian history, these
tribes must have in many instances progressed far beyond any
[241] patriarchal organization on the basis of kinship. Essentially an
[224] agricultural people, yet living also by hunting and trapping
in newly colonized and sparsely settled areas, the Russian Slavs
tended to develop beyond a purely patriarchal society as soon
as they came to inhabit small farms grouped about a fortified
[721] village which served as a focal point for defense and as a rudi-
[443] mentary market for the exchange of their products. Such of these
[487] villages as were located on the chief watercourses developed

797 then applied for aid to the Bavarians. The latter beat off the
721 Avars, but in 750 also seized control of Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola. Then, in 788, when Charlemagne deposed Duke
175* Tassilo of Bavaria, all Bavarian dependencies fell under the sway of the Carolingian realm. Even before this date, some of the local Slovene nobility had been converted to Christianity and consequently intermarried with Bavarian families. A number of churches had thus been founded in this area by missionaries from Salzburg, and a considerable proportion of the local Slovene population had also been Christianized before the epoch of Carolingian sovereignty.

797 When this sovereignty became established, missionary ac-
●177 tivities were intensified. During the reign of Charlemagne there were two centers from which missionary activity reached
175* the Slovenes: the archbishopric of Salzburg and the patriarchate of Aquileia, at the head of the Adriatic. The former soon took the lead, and after Charlemagne defeated and dispersed the Avars in 796, the area between the Danube and the Theiss which they evacuated was added to the diocese of Salzburg. Bavarian missionaries accompanied German colonists into this district, where the new Slavic occupants were rapidly converted and Germanized, especially as the Slavic landlords were rapidly eliminated. The first bishop regularly assigned to the Slovenes was Deodoricus, ordained at Salzburg in 799. His diocese extended to the river Drave, which was the dividing line between the sees of Salzburg and Aquileia.

Similar missionary activity was also set in motion among the neighboring Croats south and east of the Slovenes. As the power of the Byzantine empire declined, the Frankish power gradually extended to the Slavs of the Adriatic coastline, so that the Dalmatian Croats were subject to the Franks from 803, and Frankish authority was but little impaired by the revolt of the Croat prince Lyudevit against Louis the Pious from 819 to 822. A few years later, for political reasons, an inland Croat district headed by Margrave Pribina, a Frankish feudatory with his headquarters in Pannonia near Lake Bala-

At the same time the Eng-
175* lish, through Chancellor's expedition to the White Sea in 1553,
721 opened up the northern sea route. Ivan was also conscious of
706 the economic advantages of owning a Baltic port and began
716 operations against the Livonian order of German knights which controlled both the Gulf of Riga and the Gulf of Finland. After capturing Narva, he founded the Russian navy a century and a quarter before Peter the Great by confiscating and arming a number of German merchant vessels, for which he employed German and Swedish officers as commanders. Ivan's early successes proved a boomerang, however, since the Livonian order was dissolved and Esthonia was turned over to Sweden. This event automatically produced a collision with that country, allied with Lithuania, so that war became incessant on the western front until Ivan's death in 1584.

175* By that date the formation and the future policy of modern Russia was clearly defined. It was a foregone conclusion that future Russian sovereigns would extend Russian territory to the Black Sea. It was only a question of time when the weakening of Poland and Lithuania would bring the Dnieper valley and White Russia under Muscovite sway. It had become a cardinal item of Russian policy to control the Finnish Gulf, and maritime commerce with the west would traverse those waters
● [177] as soon as ports were either conquered or developed. The long period of Russian isolation from Europe was ended, and the difficult process of acquiring modern European techniques was about to begin. Russia had graduated from oriental domination and was on its way to becoming a major European power, never to approach the East again, save in the hope of conquest.

642 In view of the gradual evolution of Muscovite sovereignty,
632 it is important to understand also the origins of autocracy in Moscow itself. For autocracy was by no means inevitable or universal in medieval Russia, and in the principality of Kiev the early princes had always had to reckon with town assemblies which supervised and even frequently deposed them. The influence of these assemblies was large in any medieval Russian city of which the economic and political status had been deter-

V

Foundations of Russian Culture

175* Russia makes a relatively late appearance on the stage of
177 European civilization. A specifically Russian culture does not even begin until nearly 1000 A.D. with the conversion of Prince Vladimir I of Kiev in 989. In Western Europe, since the fall of the Roman Empire, a new civilization had by that time evolved from a fusion of Christian ideals with the survivals of classical culture. But medieval Russia derived its faith from Byzantium and from the Eastern branch of the church in which purely Latin culture played a subordinate role, since the dominant elements of Byzantine civilization were Hellenistic and oriental. The tradition of classical Latin culture, the influence of which never died out in Western Europe, was but one of the intellectual factors to which Russia was not exposed until its contact with the West was intensified by Peter the Great at the beginning of the eighteenth century.

178 Another vital agent in Western civilization which never
814 touched Russia directly was the complex of humanistic and renaissance ideals both in life and in literature. During the fourteenth century when the rising tide of humanism in Western Europe had revived the study of philosophy, politics, and science on the basis of classical sources, and when a fresh aesthetic pleasure was found not only in the imitation and the study of the ancients but also in the creation of new and popu-

lar forms in vernacular letters, Russia was just recovering from 178
the economically destructive and intellectually paralyzing ef- 814
fects of the Tartar conquest which had weighed the nation
down since 1240. Medieval Moscow had nothing of the thirst
for knowledge and the ambition for culture that inspired the
foundation of German universities during the last half of the
fourteenth century. It lacked the close contacts with Italy of
the sixteenth which meant for Western Europe the infusion
of art into literature and bore fruit in France in the works
of Ronsard and the Pléiade or in England in the brilliance of
Spenser and Sidney. This heritage was transmitted to Russia [177] ●
only in the eighteenth century as an element in the literary
models and traditions then taken over bodily from the West.

Apart from the classical tradition of the Middle Ages and the 779
revival of intellectual and artistic creative fervor during the 178
Renaissance, there was a third important element in Western culture to which Russia was not directly exposed: the spirit of the Protestant Reformation. Russia had received the Christian faith from Byzantium. But the Eastern Orthodox and the Western Roman Catholic Churches were split by the schism of 1054, sixty-five years after the conversion of Kiev. The Eastern Church intensified its emphasis on mysticism and asceticism without the balance of social and cultural interests which fertilized the labors of the Roman Church in Western Europe. Then, after the contacts between the Russian Church and Constantinople became difficult because of precarious communication, and still more after the fall of the Byzantine Empire fifty years before Columbus discovered America, the church in Russia became petrified in dogma and sunk in debased formalism. It maintained no such tradition of learning, no such cult of scholastic philosophy as made the Roman Church a nucleus of productive thought even in those periods of European political history in which popular culture was at its lowest ebb. It was incapable of producing such bold and independent thinkers as a Wyclif, a Hus, a Luther, or a Calvin. Indeed, had such thinkers arisen, it is doubtful whether, even in the church or

178 among the limited section of the upper class which was literate,
779 there could have been found a receptive public in whom their ideas could have taken root.

178 Thus, when the Byzantine intellectual influence (such as it was) died away, the Russian Church lost its function as a repository of culture, and never regained it before it was reduced to social impotence in our own day by revolutionaries angered at its pernicious coöperation with the autocracy. Nor had there ever arisen in Russia any fruitful movement of inspired protest on theological grounds which opposed the spirit of individual critical intelligence to the inertia of a dogma-ridden hierachy. All three of these crucial factors in the formation of the Western European outlook (the perpetuation of classical culture in the Middle Ages; humanism and the Renaissance; the Protestant Reformation) fall quite outside the purview of Russian intellectual life until introduced as contributing elements of the Western culture imposed upon Russia by Peter and his successors in the course of the eighteenth century.

175* When the Swedish warrior-merchants moved down the Rus-
●177 sian watercourses, they established themselves as the economic and military ruling class in the small towns which the Eastern Slavs themselves had founded at strategic points for trade and defense. The impulse which first unified the Eastern Slavs into what eventually became the principality of Kiev resulted from the Varangian immigration, and though the immigrants were rapidly Russified by intermarriage with the native Slavs, the princes of Kiev still maintained intimate contact with Scandinavia. At the same time, their economic needs kept them in close relations with the Byzantine Empire for a century before the conversion of Kiev and for two centuries and a half thereafter.

177 Although Byzantine culture had its weaker aspects, we are
643 too prone to underestimate its level and its service to the world, since nearly five centuries separate us from its collapse before the onslaught of the Turks. For while Western Europe was going through the painful process of civilizing the Germanic

invaders as they fused with the native stocks, the Eastern Empire had grafted upon the legacy of Rome the picturesque and flamboyant features of oriental Christianity. Its autocratic sovereigns were the agents of God on earth under a system which combined in them the attributes of emperor and pope, and this factor ought especially to be borne in mind, because it not only explains the autocratic tradition later set up by the princes of Moscow but also lies at the root of the Russian tendency to attribute to all their rulers a sort of superhuman status. The superlative adulation showered on Joseph Stalin in our own day is in part a remote reflex of Byzantine influence. Then too, Constantinople before the arrival of the Crusaders was the greatest center of material civilization in the occidental world. Its buildings rivaled Rome in its prime. Its highly organized and stratified society, the splendor of its religious observances, its military prowess under the more gifted emperors, and its general atmosphere of wealth could not fail to create a lasting impression on visitors from less advanced regions. 177 643

But Byzantine civilization lacked the punch and the drive which characterized the best days of the Roman Empire or the realm of Charlemagne. In intellectual and literary matters the Eastern Empire was conservative. It studied the past without rivaling it with the products of contemporary creative imagination. It was compilatory rather than original. Byzantine scholars were the most learned men of their day, but their learning was accumulative, not productive. Byzantine historians composed voluminous chronicles without evolving a philosophy of history, while Byzantine theologians dissipated their energy on amenities of dogma argued with a bitterness which we should nowadays associate only with partisan politics. The Byzantine Church was more political than the Roman, more closely affiliated with the state, and hence less fundamentally spiritual in outlook. The literary tradition transmitted by the Byzantine Church was stiff and formalistic. and it was the misfortune of medieval Russia that the Byzantine influence was weakened by political events before it was absorbed by the 814 829 175*

814 younger state in a volume which might have served as a firm
829 basis for the development of a characteristic native culture.
175 The Russians before the Tartar invasion were always pupils;
they originated very little that was independent of Byzantine
models either in literature or in art.

●177 In art, however, this imitation was productive and created
341 an architectural and a decorative tradition which lasted down
into modern times. By the date of Vladimir's conversion, the
basilica as a type of church architecture in Byzantium had been
largely replaced by the cruciform church with one or with
five cupolas. This was the type transmitted to Russia and still
worthily represented by the great medieval churches of Kiev,
Novgorod, Vladimir and even Moscow, though in the metropolis
the more exotic forms and the onion-shaped dome derived
177 from wooden architecture prevail. The highly conventionalized
532 art of the icon dominated Russian painting until Western influences
began to seep in during the seventeenth century, but
this tradition was still vital enough before the first World War
to influence the art of nineteenth-century religious and historical
painters. For where the Byzantine tradition had taken
firm root, the aesthetic appeal was long-lived and enduring.

538 In literature, along with lapidary works of religious implication,
186 the Russian national spirit began to manifest itself in
historical compilations during the eleventh century, and literary
reflexes of folk poetry had already appeared before the
Tartar conquest. But a truly national literature stems from a
long educative process, and this process was interrupted in
medieval Russia both by domestic politics and by nomadic
inroads.

177 Where domestic disorders merely retarded the intellectual
779 advance of medieval Russia, the Tartar incursion brought it
to a full stop. It has already been noticed what material impoverishment
it had caused. But the Tartar domination was a
far more serious factor in the deterioration of cultural and
spiritual values. The church, to be sure, was treated with
tolerance by the Tartars because it preached submission to

212 acterize them as well-read and good linguists for their day and
871 time. But during the Tartar hegemony such items are totally lacking. Not only the princes but even the higher clergy were frequently illiterate. Dmitri Donskoi could hardly read, and Basil II, Ivan the Terrible's great-grandfather, could neither read nor write. At the Council of Florence in 1439, Pope Eugene IV was told that the contemporary Russian bishops had little learning, and a feeble light of culture was kept burning in the Russian Church of this period solely by the appointment of Greek metropolitan bishops in Moscow. Only at the end of the fifteenth century do we encounter new interest in the foundation of schools for training the clergy, and considerable pressure in this direction was exercised by the Greek and South Slavic scholars who emigrated to Russia to escape the yoke of the Turks.

793 The advancement of clerical scholarship during the reign of
● 177 Ivan III (1462-1505) was accompanied by a characteristic effort
175* to acquire foreign techniques. Here, of course, we have an early example of what was to repeat itself so often in later days whenever the advancement of Russia required new mechanical skills. Under Ivan III Italian specialists were particularly active. The Bolognese architect Rudolfo Fioravanti not only built the Cathedral of the Assumption in the Kremlin, but also cast cannon, while Alevisio Novi, of Milan, designed and built the adjacent Cathedral of Saint Michael, in which were buried all subsequent Muscovite tsars to the time of Peter the Great. Miners, silversmiths, masons, and even an organist were imported from Hungary. Ivan the Terrible settled on the outskirts of Moscow in the so-called German suburb all German metalworkers who had been captured in his Livonian wars, and in 1567 obtained from England a doctor, an apothecary,
793 and various goldsmiths. The Tsar was interested not only in
175* material progress but also in raising the intellectual level of priests and officials, for it had been noted in the Church Council of 1551 that the opportunities for education were as yet slight. Besides, as the principality of Moscow developed into a

175* selves in the cities, there was as yet no prospect for the forma-
566 tion of a growing and self-conscious middle class whose aspirations might have sown the seeds of progress. As a result, during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries all intellectual advance was confined to the aristocratic and ruling minority.

175* In the seventeenth century, however, the door was again
●177 opened to Western influence by the need for self-defense. Foreign mercenaries entered the Russian army, which now became a professional force. New mines and arsenals were opened. The foreign colony founded at Moscow by Ivan the Terrible (the German suburb), though scattered during the upheaval of 1598-1612, was soon repopulated with merchants, technicians, and artisans, and their advanced notions of material comfort influenced those Russians who came into contact with them. Artamon Matveyev, the able foreign minister of Michael's son, the Tsar Alexis (in turn Peter the Great's father), married a Scotch lady, and was one of the first Russian nobles to set up his household on a Western scale. Through him notions of contemporary culture penetrated even to the court.
[562] Natalia Narishkina, Peter the Great's mother, was Matveyev's ward, and though Scotch on her mother's side, was probably the first Muscovite lady of her day to receive even a moderate education and to emancipate herself from the seclusion in which noblewomen had vegetated since the Tartar conquest.

177 While material progress was largely implemented by the
871 German technicians resident in Moscow, new theological and
797 literary ideas penetrated the empire by another route. It may be recalled that Kiev and the Dnieper valley were conquered by the Lithuanians in 1363. Then by the fusion of Poland and Lithuania at the end of the fourteenth century, the whole Ukraine became exposed to Polish colonization and cultural influence. By the sixteenth century, Polish intellectual life was entirely under the control of the Jesuits, who developed an intense but largely unsuccessful proselytizing activity among the Orthodox Ukrainians. As a counterpoise against Jesuit influence, the Orthodox clergy of the Kiev area opened schools

which taught the late renaissance disciplines on which the 177 ●
Poles themselves were fed. This process culminated in the 871
establishment of a college at Kiev which was founded in 1622 797
by Peter Mogila, the great Orthodox Bishop of Kiev. An alumnus of this school, Simeon Polotski, who was already known to Tsar Alexis as a scholar and poet, migrated to Moscow in 1663, where he founded a small monastery school, and in 1667 became tutor to the Tsar's eldest son. Simeon was the first influential exponent at Moscow of renaissance scholarship on a Latin basis, and from 1667, when the Ukraine was ceded by Poland to Moscow, the impact of Western influences through Kievan channels was immediately intensified. That this infusion of a new spirit did not take place without violent opposition goes without saying, but destiny was on the side of the progressives, even though progress was appallingly slow.

It is apparent, however, that increasingly broader breaches 175*
had been splitting the Chinese Wall of Muscovite self-suffi- 643
ciency ever since the time of Ivan III. But Peter the Great set 179
out to demolish it with one charge. For a prince of Moscow, his upbringing was exceptional. His education had been fragmentary, but his free contacts with foreign technicians while he lived in the country near Moscow during the regency of his sister Sophia embued him with a profound taste for military and naval science and mechanics. Essentially practical and rationalistic, he departed from Muscovite tradition in caring nothing for the church as a vessel of dogma and used it only insofar as it was adaptable to his purposes. His boundless energy strained toward goals far beyond the comprehension of any but an infinitesimal minority of his subjects, the rest of whom he undertook to reform and modernize by brute force. But he knew Russia could not become a major European power without the knowledge by which to use the fruits of modern technique. This knowledge he literally drove into the Russians at the point of the bayonet. Since his eye was permanently fixed on material progress, he cared little for abstract learning. His idea of literature was propaganda, and the for-

175* eign works translated in his reign were mostly technical handbooks.
643 He insisted on Western European costume, not from
177 any aesthetic consideration, but because it was more practical
and more comfortable to work in than the old Muscovite
kaftan with its long sleeves. To prosecute his ends, he was
obliged to create a bureaucracy whom he recruited from all
strata of society, having little regard for origins if they were
intelligent and efficient. Russian culture in Peter's day consisted
of the tsar and his pathetically small group of specialists
working at killing speed and pressure to overcome the national
inertia.

484 But Peter abolished previous restrictions on foreign travel,
175* and young aristocrats were sent abroad to study and to learn
643 how the Europeans actually lived. The tsar traveled in foreign
177 countries himself. Foreign specialists entered the Russian
service in unparalleled numbers. His reign brought to light
no liberal tendencies, however, since the nobility absorbed the
new bureaucracy and strengthened its hold on the national
substance. Yet the channel was opened for a new complex of
ideas. Peter forced his subjects to go abroad to study engineering
and anatomy, and they observed humanity and the mechanism
of states. Unsuccessful attempts to limit the absolute
power of the throne were made immediately after Peter's death
in 1725.

175* New notions of the amenities of social intercourse and of the
177 pleasures offered by arts, music, the dance, and literature were
535 added to Peter's more materialistic innovations when his
536 daughter Elizabeth came to the throne in 1741, with the result
that French civilization acquired a dominance in Russian intellectual
life which it began to lose only at the beginning of
the nineteenth century. The origins of the Russian ballet go
back to 1735, in the reign of Elizabeth's cousin Anna, who
also introduced Italian opera, but the French theater reached
St. Petersburg in Elizabeth's reign, which also witnessed the
beginnings of the native Russian drama composed in the
French pseudoclassic vein of Corneille, Racine, and Molière.

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

Russian poets with more form than talent now began to celebrate 175*
official occasions and generous donors with ponderous 177 ●
odes. Handbooks of French pseudoclassic literary theory, like 538
Boileau's *Art Poétique*, were translated and annotated. The [815]
Academy of Sciences, founded by Peter's widow in 1725, included
not only imported German luminaries, but the first
Russian natural scientist Michael Lomonosov, sometimes characterized
as the Russian Franklin, but whom, on account of the
universality of his talent, Pushkin, greatest of Russian poets,
called "Russia's first university." He is also notable as the first
proletarian in secular Russian letters, for he started his career
as a poor fisherman's son far north on the White Sea. The first [814]
modern Russian history was composed during the reigns of
Anna and Elizabeth by Basil Tatishchev, a former collaborator
of Peter the Great. The purely intellectual progress in the
thirty years after Peter's death was thus considerable, even
though (with rare exceptions) it was confined to the aristocracy.

It is a matter of record that when Catherine II came to 175*
the throne in 1762 she was already familiar with the theories 643
of the eighteenth-century French political philosophers and
would have welcomed an opportunity to apply them. But her
position had been won wholly by the aid of the landed gentry
and the aristocratic guard regiments, who were unlikely to
surrender any of their prerogatives or to consent to any mitigation
of the institution of serfdom on which their economic
existence was based. The great empress thus contributed little
to social progress, and her educational innovations remained
for the most part on paper. Yet through her interest in the
satirical journal and in the drama, she stimulated the progress
of Russian letters even if her social initiatives were weak. In 175*
that field others carried the torch. A Russian customs official, 814
Alexander Radishchev, who had studied at Leipzig and digested
the liberal philosophy of the day, in 1780 fired the opening
gun against serfdom, and though the exploit sent him to
Siberia, its echoes did not die away until the institution was
abolished. At the same time, the spirit of social service inspired

pean campaigns were inoculated with the republican ideas disseminated 178
by the French revolution. Essentially patriotic, they 177 ●
were eager to apply these ideals to their own country, to abolish
the autocracy, promote republican government, raise the
standard of education, and do away with the abuses of serfdom
They continued with greater energy, though often with little
judgment, the task begun by Radishchev.

Here the Russian revolutionary movement begins among an 185
enlightened fraction of the ruling class. Great writers like 538
Pushkin and Lermontov, each after brief romantic digressions,
grew up to treat the seamy side of reality, both in the tragedy
of the humble who are scarcely considered human by those
they serve, or the misfortune of the gifted individual denied a
chance at productive activity by the contemporary organization
of society. Both these talents were suspected and harassed by
the autocracy, and though each met his death in a duel, they
were as truly victims of official conservatism as those young enthusiasts
who had participated in the Decembrist conspiracy in
1825 after the death of Alexander I, and paid for it on the
scaffold or amid the snows of Siberia. But from 1825 the
cleavage between the government and the thoughtful section
of society, once opened, was never bridged again.

This mutual hostility first became acute during the reign of 175*
Nicholas I from 1825 to the Crimean War. The Decembrist 642
conspiracy had revealed that the turn to the right by Alexander
I after 1815 had created great bitterness. The same judicial and
administrative abuses that marred Catherine's reign were still
rampant, state finances were disordered, and the peasants were
rudely exploited. Nicholas at first had some notion of reform, 175*
but his suspicion of extragovernmental initiative was such that 185
he hesitated to take any concrete step. The most pressing problem [566]
was serfdom: the landlords were heavily in debt and short
of capital to provide employment for a rapidly increasing
peasant population. Peasant disorders were menacingly frequent,
but only in the western Ukraine and in Poland were
reforms introduced. Educational institutions were fettered and

Passau and Vienna, and the area devastated by the Magyars 000
was largely reoccupied by the year 1000.

At this period,[1] German missionary work in the Slavic dis- 175*
tricts south of the Danube proceeded not from Regensburg or 797
Passau, which were mainly occupied with the German settlements along the Danube, but from Bamberg. Missionaries from this diocese lived among the Slavs of Carinthia which was rapidly settled by colonists from Franconia and the middle Rhineland, as opposed to the predominantly Bavarian origin of the German settlers in Austria itself. While Bamberg was thus active in Carinthia (roughly the valley of the Drave east and west of Villach), Bavarian missionaries from Freising in Bavaria occupied themselves with Carniola (Krain), the region of the Save valley somewhat further southwest (the hinterland of Trieste), and here the colonists were again Bavarian. The Slovene population found by these German newcomers in Carinthia, Carniola, and Styria (originally a portion of Carinthia), was less driven out or exterminated than it was repressed. Documentary evidence reveals German and Slavic per-
sonal and place names side by side. The politically and socially [513]
dominant class was everywhere German. In Austria along the Danube, from which the Slavic population had been driven by the Avars before Carolingian times, the peasantry was almost exclusively Bavarian. But in Carinthia and Carniola, German peasants lived in close proximity to the native Slovenian peasantry which remained most numerous southwest of the Mur river in the valleys of the Drave and Save. Peculiar conditions on the right bank of the Danube thus explain the southward contraction of the Slovenes away from this river and their constant subservience in later days to Austrian political influence.

German influences in Moravia and their unfortunate conse- 175*
quences for the mission of Constantine and Methodius have 177 ●
already been mentioned. Even while the brothers were still active, the struggle for Frankish supremacy was going on and

[1] [10th century -- Analyst]

175* by 874 the vassalage of Moravia was definitely established.
177 After the epoch of Constantine and Methodius, all prospect of Moravian independence was destroyed by the Magyar invasion of the year 900, and for a century this region remained under Hungarian control until it was acquired by Bohemia in 1003. The decline of Moravia was paralleled by the rise of Bohemia. Early in the ninth century Charlemagne had invaded Bohemia, and in 849 the Bavarian Nordgau was founded as a barrier against the Czechs. This same epoch witnessed a gradual consolidation of the Czech cantons into a single state, as well as the baptism of numerous Czech notables at Regensburg. By the close of the ninth century, Bohemia became a vassal state of Germany and a part of the Regensburg diocese. German colonization into the district of Eger, only recently a bone of contention between the Czechs and Germans, began early in the tenth century, and paralleled Bavarian aggression on the southwestern frontier. The first half of that century was signalized by repeated German invasions of Bohemia from the north, and the situation was not stabilized until 971 when, under Otto I, the first Bohemian bishopric was established at Prague and subordinated to the Archbishop of Mainz. Soon thereafter Benedictine monasteries were founded, and aristocratic Czech circles were rapidly imbued with German culture.

Contacts between Czechs and Germans were intensified all during the eleventh century. German colonists (traders, farmers, technicians) arrived in large numbers. The annual fair at Prague came to be dominated by resident German merchants who occupied a position of virtual extraterritoriality, having their own magistrates and living under German law. Benedictine foundations were supplemented by Premonstratensian and Cistercian religious houses, who competed with their predecessors for privileges and donations. The mountainous parts of Bohemia were not opened to German colonization until nearly 1200 when numerous German settlers moved in through the Eger valley, and during the next century the Germans settled the southern, western, and eastern frontiers of

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

Bohemia. Sometimes a Bohemian village received so many 175*
German colonists that it was practically changed into a German 177
settlement. Czech towns frequently were obliged to alter
their traditional character and adopt German usages. The
nobles began to resurvey and repartition the lands attached
to these villages, forcing the Czech peasants to pay rent and
to assume all obligations applied to the newer settlers. The
Czechs were obliged to accept these innovations for fear of
being dispossessed in favor of the German newcomers, and
this process continued until the early fifteenth century and the
period of the Hussite Wars.

The Germanization of Bohemia progressed most rapidly
after the year 1200. King Václav (Wenceslas) I was a great
friend of the German colonists, even to the point of driving the
Czech peasants out of his native town and settling it with
Germans, and his example was eagerly followed by the Bohemian
nobility. It even became the custom to rechristen local
castles with German names and to give new ones such names
to start with, till the country bristled with Löwenbergs, Steinbergs,
Rosenbergs, and Rosenthals. New monasteries were 175*
headed by German abbots who systematically forgot the Old 177
Slavonic liturgy and the great tradition of Methodius, though 795
he was buried at Velehrad, from 1201 the site of a Cistercian
house. Among the German militant orders, the Knights of St.
John were permitted to settle German colonists anywhere
upon their lands. These settlers were exempt from local laws
and freed from local duties and obligations. Both Templars
and Hospitallers had established churches at Prague before
1255. About the same period, Dominicans and Franciscans also
founded their first Bohemian houses, including both German
and Italian friars. The German colony at Prague was the oldest 175*
and richest foreign group within the country, since all other 177
German settlements were either in rural districts or in the
mountainous mining regions.

The favors extended to the Germans at Prague were not
dictated by sentiment but by practical interests, since they

175* 177 insured the commercial and economic prosperity of the country. The section of Prague now known as the Old Town was by the year 1200 almost wholly occupied by Germans, and was fortified by its own wall and moat. German law, craftsmanship, and commercial ability were particularly fruitful in the development of provincial civic centers during the twelfth century, and in the next hundred years they attained a high level of prosperity with flourishing handicrafts and agriculture. [439] Their trade relations extended to Venice, Rome, Hamburg, Brandenburg, and Flanders; the primary article of Bohemian export was textiles. German colonization not only founded [311] towns but also increased the number of free farmers. These German rural colonists were most interested in the settlement of the less fruitful districts, especially in the forests of the western and northern borders of Bohemia. Since the development of this land required much hard work, the native Czech peasantry had never been intensely concerned with it, and it therefore yielded no profit to the landlords until the Germans began to exploit it. Hence the colonists received attractive terms in the guise of local self-government and tax exemptions in order to induce them to take it up. These circumstances thus favored extensive German settlement in the border districts simultaneously with the evolution of a prosperous and wealthy German middle class in the growing Bohemian cities.

175* 177 It is important to dwell on these conspicuous factors in the early development of Bohemia in order to show that the German penetration into this basically Slavic area occurred far back in the Middle Ages and is by no means a situation of recent growth. Since German settlements in the frontier districts actually took up land which the Czechs themselves had never occupied, any attempt to establish the frontiers of Czechoslovakia only on strategic considerations without regard to the conditions under which the country developed simply did violence to history and was inevitably destined to provoke discord. Whatever one may think of Nazi policy toward Czechoslovakia, the fact remains that the Germans had contributed

just as much to the building up of Bohemia as did the Czechs. 175*
Apart from the early conflicts by which Bohemia became a 177
German vassal, the colonists were brought into the country
voluntarily by Bohemian princes and barons, and they could
therefore hardly be regarded in our own time as an inferior element
with restricted rights in an area to whose economic and
cultural development they had been generously contributing
for seven hundred years.

It is fair to observe, however, that internal conflict between 175*
Czech and German broke out at the time of the Hussite Wars 721
of the fifteenth century. The radical Hussites bitterly attacked 186
the German population, which was in the main composed of
faithful Catholics, and even wiped out the entire German citizenry
of numerous cities and towns, while such German residents
who compounded with the Hussite extremists were subjected
to a violent campaign of Czechization. The results of
this epoch of conflict were catastrophic. Most of what the German
element jointly with the Bohemian had built up in three
centuries of faithful effort was destroyed in less than half a
century during which the Czechs split with the Germans on
account of their loyal Catholicism. The weakness of the Hussite
movement was that, while doubtless promoting a healthy
national spirit, it broke down the traditional contacts which
in previous centuries had contributed appreciably to the advance
of culture and to the international prestige of the nation.
The succession to the Bohemian crown first passed to the house
of Austria in 1437, and Bohemia subsequently remained under
the sovereignty of the Hapsburgs uninterruptedly from
1526 to 1918. During this period of nearly three hundred
years there was obviously little doubt of the dominance of
German influence.

Before turning to early German relations with the rising 175*
Polish state, let us follow the fortunes of the Slavs who emigrated 167
westward to the basin of the Elbe. While the burden
of German colonization on the Danube front was carried by
the Bavarians with some aid from the Franconians, the same

175* homes after the Peace of Westphalia in 1648. In Silesia, how-
798 ever, the persecutions incident to the counter-reformation
caused the migration into Poland of some 200,000 Germans, who were responsible for the creation of the textile industry in western Poland. In eastern Poland as well, the German element played a prominent role. In 1648, for instance, when the Cossack Hetman Bogdan Chmelnitski, aided by the Crimean Tartars, threatened eastern Galicia, the German inhabitants of Lemberg paid one third of the ransom by which the city was saved, and German officers and soldiery fought on the Polish side in all the battles of the period.

175* Sweden came out of the Thirty Years' War greatly strength-
131 ened by the momentary possession of the mouths of the Oder,
the Elbe, and the Weser, and its king, Charles X, thinking to gain the support of the Elector of Brandenburg for further conquests at Poland's expense, recognized him in 1656 as Duke of Prussia, thereby bringing East Prussia under the sovereignty of Brandenburg. Then, by the Treaty of Wehlau, the next year, the Poles surrendered their claims to East Prussia, thereby assuring the rising Prussian state of the undisputed possession of this area until the Seven Years' War, though it was returned to Prussia after the death of the Empress Elizabeth of Russia in 1762. Silesia was regained by Prussia the next year, the Vistula valley south of Danzig fell to the German share by the first partition of Poland in 1772, and the Posen area followed by the second partition of 1793. Such, then, in its broadest outlines, is the process by which the political frontier between Germany and Poland was determined prior to 1914.

● 177 Until the nineteenth century there was little racial hostility
175* between German and Slav. The German expansion eastward
648 during the Middle Ages had been dictated by religious and
economic motives, and the conflicts in which Poland, as an independent state, was involved with its neighbors before the partitions were the result of dynastic ambitions and jealousies rather than of any collision of national ideologies. The practical services rendered to the development of agriculture, trade,

and industry by German immigrants to Bohemia and Poland 175*
require no demonstration. By virtue of its close political asso- 177
ciation with western Europe, Bohemia was speedily drawn into 648
European intellectual life, and as early as the thirteenth century Bohemian authors were reproducing in their own language the forms and content of German medieval literature. International culture was still more widely disseminated after the foundation of the University of Prague in 1348, and the Hussite movement produced a wave of intellectual activity which lasted until the Thirty Years' War in the seventeenth century.

Poland, because of its comparative remoteness and political 175*
instability, was not subject to the same cultural stimuli, and 177
the services rendered by the German settlers in Polish terri- 517
tory were exclusively practical and materialistic. The influence of the Polish crown was never strong enough, nor were its holders cultured enough, to exert a civilizing influence comparable to that which radiated from Prague. Only in the six- [871]
teenth century do we meet with a striking development of Polish literature, and here the productive influences were more those of the Renaissance than specifically German, especially since local education was dominated by the Jesuits and strictly limited to the classical curriculum. While German economic influence was strong in both the great western Slavic states, it was Bohemia which profited the most from the absorption of German culture, and it was not until the seventeenth century that political events halted the intellectual advance so auspiciously begun.

Yet it was in Bohemia that the first seeds of a new Slavic 182
racial consciousness sprouted early in the nineteenth century. 814
The age of enlightenment had emphasized the ideals of humanity, tolerance, and culture, and these ideals were spread throughout the Austro-Hungarian monarchy by the reforms of Joseph II. As a matter of fact, the principle of nationality was first formulated by a German, for it was Goethe's great friend and mentor Johann Gottfried Herder, who declared that "the

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

in the Russian section, and at a slower rate under the German 000
regime. After 1867, the Poles under Austrian sovereignty en- 565
joyed the greatest relative degree of freedom. The local ad- 186
ministration passed entirely into Polish hands, the universities 871
of Cracow and Lemberg were Polonized, and Polish was ad- 175*
mitted as the official language everywhere except in the military and the postal services. In the Prussian area, the German administration adopted a liberal policy until 1830, when German became the official language, though the local church and the school system remained Polish.

Before 1848, however, pan-Slavic ideals filtered in from Bohemia, and that year saw open revolt in the Posen area. As the middle class grew in numbers, the influence of the nobility waned, and improved educational facilities favored the dissemination of Polish culture and national ideals among the masses. As industry grew in western Germany, there was also a considerable emigration of German residents from the Polish province. German authorities estimate that this movement shifted some three million Germans out of this area during the last half of the nineteenth century. Their places in the cities, which had hitherto been predominantly German, were taken by Polish workers who came in from the country, with the result that the proportion of German population in the Polish cities under German rule declined. At the same time, the general prosperity of Germany benefited the Polish district, the wealth and productivity of which were greatly enhanced during the nineteenth century, and educational opportunities naturally far surpassed those available in either Russian Poland or Galicia.

This survey of relations between German and Slav from the 177
earliest times to the last century demonstrates with reasonable clarity that once the barbarities of the medieval German expansion period were over, every advance in civilization which the Germans experienced was passed on to such of the Western Slavs as were ripe to receive it. Though the Bohemians lost their political independence in the sixteenth century, they had already acquired such a high degree of culture that they were

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

● 177 not likely to lag behind the general movement of European civilization. Though not independent, they nevertheless enjoyed a degree of political stability which the Poles lacked. On the other hand, even if the partitions splintered the Polish state, the material and intellectual progress registered under German rule in Posen and under Austrian sovereignty in Galicia also brought the Poles into closer touch with Western Europe and made them participants in the march of progress.

800 We should not for one moment wish to belittle the Bohemian or the Polish thirst for independent statehood, nor ignore the oppressive measures to which Poles and Czechs alike were frequently subjected by their masters who spoke a different language. But on the record there is no insuperable reason why peaceful coöperation between Slav and German is not possible, and there is no prospect for peace in Europe until this coöperation is reëstablished. Time and the pressure of events will wipe away the official German opinion that the Slavs are an inferior race, just as it has wiped out the brutal German ruling class which holds this opinion. But it is the task of our generation to work out some system whereby political sovereignty is not the ultimate aim of national aspirations, and whereby national units not economically self-sufficient—as none of the Western Slavs are—may join in political associations which guarantee their economic welfare without jeopardizing their characteristic cultures and ideals.

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

The material and intellectual contributions of German settlers in Bohemia and Poland, not only during the later 175* Middle Ages but also in more recent times, were a vital factor 177 in the progress of Western Slavic civilization. The very ideals of nationality which inspired modern agitation for the revival of Western Slavic national states sprang from the brains of German philosophers and political theorists. Even the basic concepts on which the dictatorship of the proletariat was erected in the Soviet Union stem from the theories of the son of a converted Jewish family in the Rhineland who was steeped in the philosophy of Hegel. After the kingdom of Bohemia became subject to the Hapsburgs in the sixteenth century, and after the partitions of Poland brought sections of the former kingdom under Austrian and Prussian sovereignty, the dominance of German influence in these areas was still more firmly established, and there can be no question that the Western Slavs, even under alien rule, participated fully in the advance of Western civilization with which they were in close and lasting contact.

Nationalist aspirations, as we have seen, developed during 175* the first half of the nineteenth century and, while most keenly 186 shared by the Western Slavs, were also transmitted to their South Slavic brethren by the Serbian and Bulgarian students who studied abroad. These aspirations were natural and logical. On the other hand, there was a marked tendency among the Western Slavs to minimize the economic security they enjoyed as members of larger states and to exaggerate the cogency of such traditions of national independence as they possessed. Their nationalistic sentiments were also stimulated both by the spectacle of the difficulties endured by their kindred under Russian rule and by the assumption of superiority by their German masters. There is no question but that the life of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy would have been prolonged had the constitution of 1867 been so modified as to grant its Slavic elements a degree of autonomy comparable to that possessed by German Austrians and by Magyars, since the Bohemians never secured equal political rights in Austria,

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

186* 558 of his successor, Cyprien Robert, from Anjou, was scarcely less romantic. After the 1848 rising he was suspected of having left for America, with the followers of Cabet, in search of Icaria. This sufficed to give credence to the idea that Slavology tends to unbalance those who profess it.

186* 814 With Louis Léger, it is true, this science found its equilibrium and its discipline. But under Léger's guidance, Slavonic research tended to centre around Philology, and this orientation seems to have been permanent. The instruction gained in solidity what it lost in breadth; its beneficiaries, necessarily restricted in number, have never succeeded in forming a political team of Slavicisers such as would have given our diplomacy the orientation it lacked at the time of the two great crises of the present century.

Apart from what we may call Germanic interference, the Slavs have done a great deal towards helping to obscure or to emphasise their own characteristic features. What chance was there, in the past, of forming impartial ideas about the Russians from Polish testimony, or vice versa? About the Czechs, from Russian testimony? Or about the Catholic Slavs, from the testimony of the Orthodox? Outside an *élite* of thinkers, poets, scholars, who were the promoters and leading spirits of Slavonic Congresses, there was, between these nations, presumed to be of the same stock, nothing but rivalry, quarrels, and mistrust—piously encouraged, moreover, by their powerful neighbours. Denominational differences were stronger than race-solidarity; the Moujik felt that a Rumanian who made his sign of the cross with three fingers was nearer to him than the Slovak or the Croat who made his with his whole hand, or than the Czech philosopher, persecuted by the Austrian authorities as a 'dangerous Panslavist'.

• [177] The inter-penetration of the different sections of Slavonic culture was so little developed that the great Russian poet, Pushkin, was deceived by Mérimée's literary hoax, when the latter published, under the title of *Guzla,* a so-called translation of Dalmatian songs.

186* 538 When Russian literature was revealed to the West, the latter greeted it with a defiant, or perverse, curiosity. *Monstrum invenimus.* French scholars saw in it less a new philosophy of life than an intellectual or sentimental pathology. De Vogüé, who introduced the Russian novel into France, warned his readers

no oppressor of the Slavonic race other than the Turk, Krijanich 186*
added the German. He was the ancestor of the Russian 178
Slavophiles of the nineteenth century. He was completely out 538
of harmony with his age, which could not understand an [568]
argument combining the Slavonic idea with Roman Uniatism. He met the usual fate of a precursor. Having offered his services as Librarian to the Czar Alexis Mikaïlovitch, he obtained from Moscow a mission to reform Russian spelling; the manuscript of this work was recovered at Tver in 1888. But it was not long before he was suspected of being a Papist agent, and was deported to Siberia, in circumstances which have never been cleared up. At Tobolsk he drew up a treatise on 'Politics' which, on the lines of Machiavelli's work, was intended to deduce, from the principles of good and evil, the laws of the art of government. Was Peter the Great acquainted with this treatise, and was he influenced by it? Unfortunately, that is a matter which scholarship has not yet been able to decide. After that we lose trace of Krijanich. A Dutch traveller relates that a monk of that name died under the walls of Vienna, in the ranks of Sobieski's army; such would seem to be the crowning adventure of that strange visionary, promoter of a doctrine which was to be revived two hundred years later by a pleiad of thinkers and scholars and which, freed of its denominational utopianism, will remain the 'credo' of the apostles of Slav solidarity.

After the capture of Azov from the Turks by Peter the 186*
Great in 1696, the centre of gravity of Slavonic hopes was fixed 175
in Russia. If we exclude the Polish point of view, it remained 177 ●
there for more than two centuries. The three reigns of Peter the Great, Catherine II, and Alexander I, helped to awaken the Russian national conscience by contact with the Slavs of the Balkans, Austria, and Hungary. This contact set up currents of mutual influence between sister-nations, discovering each other after long centuries of isolation and mutual ignorance. A Serbian Academician, M. Stoyanovich, published a series of testimonies from Serbs who were contemporaries of Peter the Great, from which it appears that, from this time onwards, the Southern Slavs considered Russian successes as their own.

Readers will not be surprised at the omission here of any 186*
reference to the 'Will of Peter the Great', which the Chevalier d'Eon, of dubious reputation, was said to have brought from

A folk-lore, and an historical myth, are not sufficient to create 186*
a community of political interests. Nor, even, is a 'Cultural Front'. As Pypine, a Russian Westernist, remarked: 'Before imposing a Slavonic civilisation, this would first have had to be created'.

For, in Russia itself, there were two opposing currents regard- 181
ing the problem of the destinies of the Slavonic world. One, 829
with Tchadaiev, saw Russia's past merely as a chaos of historical misunderstandings, and events devoid of meaning. Such was the doctrine of the Westernists, whose chiefs, moving in aristocratic or liberal circles, considered Europeanism as the measure of good and evil. The other, with the Slavophile school, refused to acknowledge the European culture as universal, and maintained that the country's future lay entirely in the development of her own values.

Between the two schools, Danilevsky, a biologist hostile to the Darwinian theories, about 1860 formulated the problem of the relations between 'Russia and Europe', with all its implications.

He began by stressing the anomaly represented by the notion 181
of Europe—a survival of the *orbis romanus*. There was no real 829
separation between the European and Asiatic continents; the 177
Urals were not a frontier. Now the question of a distinction between Europe and Asia was of prime importance to Russia, placed as she was, like a hinge between these two worlds.

This distinction, although a geographical anachronism, nevertheless corresponded to indisputable facts in the domains of history and civilisation—facts which sufficed to demonstrate that Russia had no decisive bonds with Europe. Danilevsky summed them up as follows:—

The Romance and Germanic peoples had a certain number of features in common, none of which was found in Russia's past.

They divided up the heritage of the Roman Empire, in which Russia had no part.

They were influenced by Germanic institutions, around which crystallised the notion of the State. The West was the patrimony of the countries who succeeded to the Empire of Charlemagne. Now Russia remained outside this community, which the Middle Ages designated under the name of 'Christendom'.

181 Russia knew nothing of Feudalism. She remained aloof from
829 the intellectual current which began with Scholasticism and
• 177 ended with scientific investigation. She was untouched by the
Reformation. Whenever she entered into conflict with the Holy See, it was simply as a foreign power.

In short, Russia did not belong to the European family. If she was connected with it, said Danilevsky, it was by adoption, in the manner of a wild stock, on which an exotic branch has been grafted.

781 But had not religion, at least, engendered a spiritual solidarity
829 between her and the West? Was not Orthodoxy a disruption of
771 the Christian community and had not six centuries of
Œcumenism forged indissoluble bonds between the Germano-Roman and the Slavo-Greek worlds?

No, replied Danilevsky. The Western Church was the triumph of Rationalism, differentiated by a positive sign among the Catholics, a negative one among the Protestants. Rome sacrificed internal to external unity, the Reformation sacrificed true liberty to the idea of external liberty. The Eastern Church was neither a system nor a hardened doctrine; it was all love and renunciation. Much more than dogmatic opposition was involved—these were two concepts of the spiritual life which were poles apart. That explained why the Orthodox Christians had come to regard Islam as the involuntary and unwitting saviour of Slavism. By tolerating independent churches under her sway, Islam protected them against the assimilating or unifying ascendency of Latin Catholicism. A Patriarch of Constantinople had said that *Providence had chosen the Osmanlis to defend Orthodoxy against the Western heresy.*

186* So that Russia, according to Danilevsky, saw in Europe
829 nothing to give her a feeling of historical or spiritual solidarity.
Such was, moreover, the point of view of the great Russian novelist, Dostoievsky; to show oneself a true Russian was, for him, *to place oneself on the battleground of all European hostilities.* It was to constitute a unity, not *in* Europe, but opposed to it.

The thesis of the biologist met that of the novelist. A harmful policy (said Danilevsky in his turn), during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, associated Russia with the European balance of power. Now this balance of power affected only the

186* 668 feature which most reveals the Russian exclusivism that animated the Slavophiles is the very fact that their campaign did not succeed in creating a more effective current of intellectual exchanges. In 1850, a young Russian aristocrat asked for a passport to go abroad, in order to study 'Slavonic peoples and ways'. His application was refused, on the grounds that 'between Moscow and Kamchatka there was ample space in which to pursue this branch of study'.

[563] Among the Orthodox Slavs there was, moreover, up to the middle of the nineteenth century, only one State exhibiting a certain independence, and that was Montenegro. After a long period of subjection to Venetian influence, it passed entirely under Russian tutelage. Its prince-bishops sent their nephews to study in Russia, to prepare themselves for rule. Many young Montenegrins settled there, and their descendants included several of the Russian generals who opposed the Great Army.

186* 177 ● With this exception, intellectual relations between Slavs and Russians were intermittent and restricted. If, once they had regained their independence, the Serbs and the Bulgars sent their statesmen to St. Petersburg, their students went to Vienna, to Leipzig, or to Paris. Even the Orthodox seminarists often preferred the Protestant Faculty of Tübingen to the Russian religious institutions. In short, the ascendency of Western civilisation remained the chief obstacle to an assimilation of Russian culture by the Slavonic peoples.

186* 668 575 The Slavophiles, despite the lack of support (and, very soon, the distrust) which their initiative experienced from the Imperial Government, did not allow themselves to be discouraged. The Moscow Slavonic Committee, founded immediately after the Congress of 1867, and its St. Petersburg branch, set up in the spring of 1868, were continually active in the years that followed. Among other activities, they established charitable societies, which educated young Slavs from the oppressed regions, and publishing houses, which produced books, dictionaries, maps, reviews, etc., intended to propagate the common ideal. Between 1875 and 1878 the two organisations were very much in favour in Russian society; millions of roubles flowed into the collections sponsored by them; Aid Committees came to the assistance of refugees from Bosnia-Herzegovina; arms were sent to the Christians in revolt against Islam; a legion of Russian

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

Chapter Three

THE TRIUMPH OF THE NATIONALITIES, OR SLAVISM WITHOUT RUSSIA

THE 1914–1918 War has often been regarded as a settling 186
of accounts between Slavs and Teutons. And it was 175
certainly the Germans who did the most to popularise this over-simplified viewpoint. At the time of the Balkan crisis, Bethmann-Hollweg, the Chancellor of the Reich, reduced the possibility of a European war to a struggle between Teutonism and Slavism: *Ein Kampf zwischen Germanentum und Slawentum.* For his part, General von Moltke wrote, on February 12, 1913: 'Sooner or later will come the war between Germanism and Slavism, for which all the standard-bearers of Germanic culture and spirit must prepare'.

At the time when it was formulated, this prophecy might 177 •
have been found surprising. Indeed, in the course of the ages. 167
Teutonism had secured solid positions against the Slavs, whom, in nine centuries, it had pushed back from the Elbe to the Vistula. It had colonised, plundered, or subdued their western tribes. It penetrated into Russia by two means—the Baltic nobility, and dynastic marriages. Eleven Tsars or Tsarinas since Peter the Great were either of German blood or under German matrimonial influence. This fact alone will give an idea of the fatality which, since the eighteenth century, weighed upon the destiny of Russia. In face of this infiltration, we think of the terrible phrase addressed by Skobelev to a delegation of Serbian students in Paris: 'In our own country, we are not at home'. In short, history presented itself to the Teutons as an uninterrupted process of absorption of their eastern neighbours, or of domination over their politics.

Moreover, von Moltke's prophecy implied a Slav solidarity 186*
which was then in the realm of conjecture. History offered no 578
recent example of it. In 1848, the Slavs had nearly all fought 175
for a cause which was foreign to, even if not opposed to, Slavism. In 1885, and again in 1913, the Serbs and the Bulgars had cut each others' throats. And twelve months later, in 1914,

648 793 795 to do with the protesting prelates,[11] or openly dissociated themselves from their attitude.

771 626 795 By way of retort, the first number of the *Moscow Patriarchy* published a message from the Council of Russian Bishops, assembled for the election, inviting Christians to pray for the victory of the Red Army and the fulfilment of the scriptural text invoked by Alexander Nevsky: 'He who strikes with the sword shall perish by the sword'. On September 8, this same Council had excommunicated 'as adversaries of the Cross of the Lord, all who have been guilty of treason to the common cause of the Church and gone over to Fascism'; the bishops and clergy guilty on this head were removed from their sacred office.

* * *

186* 563 To conclude, the only obstacles to a general reconciliation of the Slavonic peoples came from the Poles. To summarise here the vicissitudes of Soviet-Polish relations since the pact of December, 1941, would mean not only relating the most stormy chapter in the Allies' war diplomacy, but also recalling the relations of the various groups among the Polish exiles, the antagonism between the London Committee and that of Lublin, the frontier problem, and also the perhaps more tragic problem of the political, religious, and social concepts on the basis of which the Polish State was to be re-born. Once again it was made very clear that Poland occupied a place apart on the map of the Slavonic world, and formed an obstacle to the realisation of full Slav solidarity.

727 177 Like the other Slavonic States, however, she had been caught up in the advance of the Russian armies sweeping across Eastern Europe—an onrush which settled the fate of the Slav nations, with or without their consent, as a consequence of their liberation. For three or four years Germany had been the second Slavonic power in the world. She had imposed on her Serbian, Croatian, Slovak, and Bulgarian satellites not only the horrors of the occupation, but also ideologies strongly opposed to their temperaments and their history; an impersonal and tyrannical idea of the State, a 'New Order' which was nothing but a hypocritical subjection, anti-Semitism which—with the exceptions of Poland and Imperial Russia—the Slavonic nations had always regarded
000 with horror. When the collapse came, all these nations turned

---

[11] **Among these, however, we must include the head of the Russian Orthodox Church in the Argentine.**

[J. Poland - Analyst]

795 •177 648 659 But it goes without saying that it was upon the Churches of the Balkan States that Muscovite influence was exercised most directly and decisively. In Yugoslavia the hierarchy created at Sremski Karlovtsi by Russian exiles, and which Mgr. Antoine, ex-Archbishop of Kiev, had organised immediately after the First World War, was dissolved and had to go into exile. A Russian delegation, presided over by the Metropolitan Serge of Odessa, went to present a mitre to Joseph, Metropolitan of Serbia, in February, 1946. The real object of this mission, which spent a month in Belgrade, was to define the future relations between the Yugoslav Church and the Muscovite Church.

186* 795 659 Then arose the case—a rather complicated one, it must be confessed—of the Serbian Orthodox Patriarch, Mgr. Gavrilo. The latter had been accused by the Germans of having hidden part of the Crown treasure; he was interned, then taken to Dachau. When the Allies occupied Bavaria, he preferred retirement to Italy to a return to his country, where he was being begged to resume his duties. He adopted an attitude of opposition towards the régime established by Marshal Tito, as shown [798] by his pastoral letter of Easter, 1946. The Serbian Orthodox Church had been rather badly treated by this régime, for she had been deprived of the education of the young, religious marriage had been declared invalid in law, and she had lost most of her property. It is said that it was under the influence of the Russian clergy that her Metropolitans invited the Patriarch to return. He did, in fact, return on November 14, 1946, and had an interview with Tito, during which 'all misunderstandings were cleared up'. And, as proof of this, at the Slav Congress in Belgrade on December 11, he made a speech in which, after having recalled the sacrifices made for the 'safeguarding of truth, the application of justice, and the defence of liberty', he manifested his joy at finding that the Slavonic peoples 'sorely tried by the bitter experience of their recent and remote past, were expending all their energy in their spiritual unity'. 'Slav solidarity', he concluded, 'is manifested, today more than ever, with the help of our mother, Russia, and of Generalissimo Stalin; it is the surest guarantee of the development of the Slavonic peoples'.

186 795 648 659 In Bulgaria the clergy, after seventy-five years of schism, returned to nominal obedience to the Patriarchate of Con-

pursued on parallel lines, in Slav and non-Slav countries alike. 177 .18

On the instigation of Moscow, these countries entered into 186
treaties of friendship and mutual assistance. These were so 648
worded as to give the impression, at first, of being designed to 175
wipe out long-standing heritages of hatred or distrust between peoples hitherto antagonistic to one another. Passed for a period of twenty years, and all on the same lines, these treaties were signed on the following dates:—

November 27, 1947: between Bulgaria and Yugoslavia.
December 8: between Hungary and Yugoslavia.
December 16: between Bulgaria and Albania.
December 19: between Yugoslavia and Rumania.
January 16, 1948: between Bulgaria and Rumania.
January 24: between Hungary and Rumania.
February 4: between the Soviet Union and Rumania.
March 18: between the Soviet Union and Bulgaria.
April 23: between Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria.

The commentaries which accompanied the signing of these [829]
agreements spoke, with ever-growing emphasis, of the 'peril' to the peace of Europe involved in the attitude of the Western powers. Centred at first on the German menace, they subsequently referred to fresh risks, clearly indicated. Thus the Soviet radio declared that the pact between Bulgaria and Moscow acquired significance from the fact that 'certain Western powers have, under the patronage of the United States, taken the creation of military blocs as the basis of their policy'.

Even the idea of a 'Balkan Federation', which in 1944 had found partisans in Moscow, was gradually pushed into the background, for fear that the essential core of this federation, the Bulgarian-Yugoslav bloc, might create a Slav community, which should one day grow strong enough to adopt an attitude of independence in regard to the Soviet Union. So, although it was originally inspired by Russia, this project for a union was later to be denounced by the Kremlin as a ruse of 'Western imperialism', and Dimitrov, the Bulgarian Premier, was to be disavowed by Moscow, in January, 1948, for having made an untimely allusion to it.

* * *

177
The standardisation of Soviet policy in Europe was to take 648
666
its definite shape in the conference held in Warsaw in September, 175

•177 648 665 175 1947, by the delegates of the Communist Parties of nine European nations. It was then decided to set up a 'Joint Information Bureau' (*Kominform*), whose function would be to ensure organic liaison between these different parties, with a view to co-ordinating their activities and pooling their experience. A communiqué was broadcast on October 9 by the delegate of the Russian Communist Party, Idanov, a member of the Soviet Politburo. He contrasted the 'war-mongering' of the Western States with the 'pacifism' of the 'popular democracies' placed [185] under the influence of the Soviet Union. He[1] affirmed the mission of the Communist Parties to combat 'attempts at enslavement', the most dangerous form of which was, in Moscow's view, the Marshall Plan.

The seat of the new organisation, which was to publish a bi-mensual organ, was fixed in Belgrade. Its activities, in conformity with policy dictated by the Kremlin, aggravated the crisis in relations between East and West, and opened the period of tension to which the name of 'cold war' has been applied.

The Kominform is not a resurrection of the Komintern, dissolved in 1943. It is based, indeed, on the idea that the 'national' Communist Parties have reached a state of maturity and power which enables them to be henceforth regarded as autonomous on the plane of the common struggle against capitalist régimes.

The signatories to the Kominform's declaration were: Idanov and Malenkov (U.S.S.R.), Kardelj and Djilas (Yugoslavia), Tchervenkov and Poptomov (Bulgaria), Gheorghiu Dej and Anna Pauker (Rumania), Farkas and Revai (Hungary), Gomulka (Poland), Duclos and Fajon (France), Slanski and Bastovanski (Czechoslovakia), Longo and Reale (Italy).

The Kominform, controlled from Moscow, was rapidly to exert its activities in a domain which its promoters had not foreseen.

186* 665 648 175 Indeed, Slav solidarity, already overtaken and superseded by the watchword of Marxist unity, was to suffer a still more serious set-back from the rupture between Tito and Moscow. It was in Belgrade that the Kominform had set up its seat; from Belgrade came the blow which was to shake its authority, and the dogma of Muscovite infallibility, in the whole of Eastern Europe.

[1] [Delegate of Russian Communist Party, Idanov -- Analyst]

186* people is dark; its present is terrible, but it has rights to the
829 future." And he filled that future first of all with the hope that Russia would avoid the poison of Western Philistinism. "Philistinism—this is the last word of civilization, based on the absolute autocracy of property." Russia, by the fact that she knew only communal property, had indeed every possibility of avoiding the poisonous influences of the West.

Certainly Herzen's disgust for European Philistinism was in some degree justified, but the *esprit bourgeois* does not exhaust the content of the Western civilization. It is amazing to see how quickly that former Russian Westerner lost his psychological inclination toward Europe—toward the lights of European thought—toward the intellectual energy of Europe, its philosophy, arts, science, traditions of freedom.

In addition, Herzen had a deep belief in the essentially revolutionary mind of the Russians. "The thinking Russian is the most independent man in the world. What can stop him? Respect for the past? But what is the starting point of the history of modern Russia, if not the negation of nationality and tradition? On the other hand, the past of the Western nations has only a didactic value for us. We in no way consider ourselves the executors of their will. We share your doubts, but your faith does not warm us. We share your hatreds, but we do not understand your attachment to the heritage of your ancestors; we are too oppressed, too unhappy to be satisfied with half-freedom. You are bound by scruples, you are stopped by reservations of mind, we have no scruples, no reservations, we are lacking only in power."[56]

We have here a kind of combination of Chaadaev's pessimism
186* and the Muscovite Slavophils' optimism. The essential idea of
829 Herzen, a very Slavophil and very Russian idea, was that "the
● 177 western fruit will ripen in the Slavic world." Kucharzewski, whom I quote, very justly states: "The West produces thoughts, Russia utilizes them; to the West is alloted the task of creating, to

---

[56] Kucharzewski, *op. cit.*, vol. I, pp. 395-396.

7z Lednicki S-4 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

Russia—the role of leadership among future mankind, with the help of the ripe fruits of the work of other nations."[57]

186*
829
177 ●

When dealing with Herzen as well as with Tyutchev and Dostoevsky—but I think with Herzen even more than with the latter, one is really amazed to see how well and deeply he knew Europe. The more astonishing is, then, that lack of attachment and love for European tradition. They understand everything, but they love nothing.

All these thoughts were developed in Herzen's work *From the Other Shore* (1849), in his letter to Michelet, and a little later, in 1854, in his letter to Riberol, editor of the review *L'Homme,* and in his letter to Linton, editor of the *English Republic.* In this last publication he develops his Panslavic system in connection with the Crimean War. He states that Poland was the one Slavic country who preserved her independence. "Only Poland remained independent and strong, but this because she was less Slavic than the other nations, she was Catholic, and Catholicism is a flagrant contradiction of the Slavic genius. Hence Poland preserved independence by weakening her racial ties and by coming nearer to the Western states."

One must not, forget however, that in 1863 and in 1864, as I mentioned before, Herzen in his *Kolokol* published the most penetrating articles filled with great sympathy and admiration for Poland and the Poles.[58] He greets the Crimean War as "the beginning of a Slavic era, the Slavs will raise the banner of Socialism, and Constantinople will be the capital of the united Slavs. . . . Constantinople is one real capital of the united Slavs, it is the Rome of the Eastern Church, the center of all Slavo-Greeks—Byzantium, surrounded by a Slavic-Hellenic population . . . In any case this war is the *introduzione maestosa e marziale* of the Slavic world into universal history and at the same time *una marcia funebre* of the old world."[59]

---

[57] *Op. cit.,* p. 397.

[58] Lednicki, W.: "Russian-Polish Cultural Relations," *New Europe,* 1944.

[59] Kucharzewski, *op. cit.,* pp. 399-400.

7: Lednicki S-4 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

186* Yes, Herzen was certainly one of the most brilliant and pene-
829 trating singers of the Russian requiem for Europe, but even in
●177 this he was a pupil of the Europeans—of the Saint-Simonists,
Fourier, Cabet, and Proudhon, who violently criticized contemporary European civilization. They did for Herzen what later in the seventies Renan did for Strakhov. Strakhov filled his book *The Struggle with the West in Our Literature* with Renan's criticism. But Renan did even more—he suggested some ideas to the Russians which they didn't forget. Strakhov quotes one of them: "There still exists in the world a reserve of barbarian forces, which are almost all in the hands of Russia. As long as the civilized nations conserve their solid organization, the role of these barbarians will be almost null; but without doubt, if (from which God preserve us!) an epidemic of selfishness and anarchy brings our western states to destruction, the barbarians will accomplish their duty, which consists in raising the many forces in spoiled civilizations, in producing the vivifying current of instinct which was lost when reflection destroyed subordination, to show that readiness to sacrifice one's life for faithfulness to one's sovereign (a deed which a democrat considers low and absurd) is a source of power and leads to the possession of the world."[60]

The case of Herzen is particularly eloquent: it shows how demoralizing were the Slavophil and Panslavistic conceptions if a man of Herzen's caliber, Europeanism, and superior generosity could find himself in such a moral and spiritual impass.

186* The ultimate expression of this eastern Messianism suggested
829 by the Russian Westerners is to be found in the *Scythians*, a poet-
539 ical message which Alexander Blok addressed to the West: "Now
rejoicing, now sorrowing, now flowing with black blood, she (Russia) looks at you with hatred and with love. . . . We love everything—the heat of cold numbers and the gift of divine visions, everything appeals to us—the perspicacious Gallic thought and the gloomy German genius. . . . We remember everything—the hell of Parisian streets and the refreshing coolness of Venice,

---

[60] Strakhov, *Bor'ba s zapadom v nashey literature*, St. Petersburg, 1882, vol. I, p. 324.

186* imperialistic views on Constantinople with a policy which would necessarily favor revolutionary movements among the Slavs and compromise the gospel of his legitimism. Nevertheless, Marx, Pokrovsky and Tarle gave, as we saw, striking examples of this Machiavellism of Russian policy. Let us, however, analyze the doctrine itself and try to see what were the concrete historical and cultural realities which it had to face. We saw that one of the chief problems, that of Russo-Polish relations, has not been and could not have been solved within the frame of Slavophil or Panslavistic schemes. But what was the general picture?

197 The main argument of unity among the Slavs was of course that of language. The Slavic languages belong to the same family and it is not difficult to prove that certain similar phenomena which appear in different Slavic languages represent not a result of inter-Slavic influences but an independent parallelism of development. For the tenets of the Slavophil doctrine the fact of a common linguistic origin meant very much theoretically. Language is an expression of the relationship between man and the universe, and therefore this expression reveals a—let us say—philosophical outlook. In other words language possesses an
● [177] ideological value. On the other hand history differentiated the Slavic peoples. During long centuries they went sometimes not only through different but very often even opposite and contrasting cultural influences; and because of that the languages in their turn also differentiated to such a degree that Slavs are no longer able to understand one another. The amusing point here was the fact that the Slavophils of the various Slavic nations used German in order to communicate with each other. This was indeed a paradoxical situation for those who were trying to unite themselves first of all against Germanism. Of course Russia was and still is suggesting that the Russian language be accepted as the common language for the Slavs. But this generous offer has not
197 so far been adopted. The linguistic divergencies become even
538 more salient when we leave the field of language proper and try to apply the methods of unification to the field of belles lettres,

especially poetry, even if it be the popular poetry. A synthesis 197
appears absolutely impossible. It would be enough to compare 538
the Czech versification and all the changes it went through with the Russian and Polish to see how great are the differences. Let us take the Russian *byliny* with their assonances, which have no correspondents in other Slavic productions. On the other hand the *Shchedrivky* and the *Koladki* are ritual poems often inspired by historical subjects of a purely Ukrainian character. A quite distinct group is represented by the Serbo-Croatian and Bulgaro-Macedonian popular poetry—heroic rhapsodies which sing of the legendary Serbian hero Kralević Marko, the mother of the Jugović and her sons and many others. This poetry which served the fantasies and mystifications of Mérimée, which enchanted Goethe, Pushkin, Mickiewicz and Nodier, represents a quite special formation and a unique genre in the Slavic world. How different is the medieval Polish poetry, only semi-popular in its most distant origins, with its origin in the Church. Its lyrical starting point is to be found in the *Kyrie Eleison* and *Alleluiah*, refrains of liturgical songs.

Let us abandon for a moment this purely philological statement 795
and turn to a more essential factor which determined the 523
historical development of the Slavic nations: I have in mind religion. 177 ●
Religion divided the whole Slavic world into two parts. 538
Bulgarians, Serbians, Great Russians, Ukrainians, and White Ruthenians embraced Eastern Orthodoxy from a Byzantine source. Czechs, Croatians, Slovenes, Slovaks, and Poles embraced the Catholic religion from its Roman Source. And in addition the Czechs went through Hussism; a part of the Ukrainians and White Ruthenians adopted the Union. The Muscovite Slavophils and Panslavists were fighting against Catholicism. By that very fact they were in opposition to the whole Western Slavic world. Religion determined the cultural differentiation, and if we add to that some other historical factors we shall see that at the time when Russia was under the influence of Byzantium, of the Bulgarian and Serbian messianistic literature which formed her

7; Lednicki S-4 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

795 theory of "Moscow the Third Rome," based on all kinds of imported legends and apocryphas, Poland was shining in the sun of
563
177 the Renaissance. She had her Rabelais—Nicholas Rey, her Ron-
538 sard—Kochanowski, and a wonderfully rich and brilliant political literature connected with Latin republican writers, some of which was soon translated into foreign languages, even English.

The Southwestern Slavs, the Croatians, Slovenes, and Dalmatians also took part in the achievements of the Renaissance. They lived that period in contact with Italy while on the other hand Dalmatia was under the influence of several Byzantines. Let me recall the brilliant Italianism of Dubrovnik (Ragusa) of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and the flowering of the Dalmatian literature which followed the songs of the provencals troubadours, and of the *Dolce stil nuovo*. The Dalmatian muses found their inspiration in Petrarch, Boccaccio, Guarini, Tasso, Metastasio; this literature knew all genres from *canzone* to the pastoral drama and *la commedia dell' arte*. The Czechs went through this epoch carrying their religious reform—a heavy burden but rich in immense moral consequences. It is probably this reform that gave the definitive form to the moral and intellectual character of this Slavophil and Slavologist nation, least Slavic in its spiritual physiognomy.

The marvellous flowering of the Russian and Polish literatures in the nineteenth century represents again a kind of exception among the Slavic nations. And in spite of a close parallel development, these two literatures very often, following the same roads of literary evolution, in many ways contrast with each other.[80]

186* So even if one should try to eliminate the purely political bar-
563 riers separating the Slavic nations, such as the political antagonisms existing between Bulgars and Serbs, Serbs and Croatians, Russians and Poles, Czechs and Slovaks, Ukrainians and Great Russians, Ukrainians and Poles, etc., the problem of spiritual

[80] I have discussed these problems in a more detailed form in my article, "Existe-t-il un patrimoine commun d'études slaves?" Cf. *Le Monde Slave*, Paris, 1926.

538 nineteenth century, was only sporadically linked with earlier
197 attempts: it raised to literary usage a folk dialect of Herzegovina and emphatically rejected Church Slavonic or Russian ingredients and the influence of any older literary heritage. A similar populist tendency characterized the rise at the same period of modern literary Ukrainian which was first used in the burlesques of the very late eighteenth century, and in its further development oscillated between the Western (Polish-influenced) and the Eastern (Russian-influenced) variants. Both Standard Byelo-Russian and Macedonian modestly entered into literature in the nineteenth century and acquired civil rights—the former after the First, the latter after the Second World War. On the other hand, modern Standard Bulgarian, likewise formed during the nineteenth century after some isolated earlier attempts, strongly and consistently continued to borrow from Russian and particularly from its Church Slavonic stock. Toward the middle of the same century, the Slovaks, who had used literary Czech (somewhat adapted to their own habits), inaugurated their own literary language based on the Central Slovak dialect but patterned after standard Czech.

197 Church Slavonic perseveres as a liturgic language in several
795 slightly distinct variants: Nikon's recension is used by Greek Orthodox Slavs (and—with somewhat stronger orientation toward the old Kievan tradition—by the Greek Catholics); the pre-Nikon, Great-Russian recension is followed by the Old Believers; the Croatian Roman Catholics, in so far as they use Church Slavonic, maintain their own recension, although since the seventeenth century they have incorporated a considerable Kievan strain.

198 In the Slavic standard languages, besides Greek influence, pre-
177 vailing in the area of the Eastern Church, and Latin, predominant in that of the Western, there can be noted a strong Turkic lexical layer in Eastern Slavic and in the majority of Southern Slavic languages, and a German stamp on the vocabulary and phraseology of Slovenian and of Western Slavic languages and on the technical terminology of modern Russian. To some degree all the main Slavic literary languages in their recent phase bear French imprints. Neighboring languages have undergone an appreciable Slavic influence, principally in their vocabulary. This is particularly so

for the Baltic languages, Albanian, Greek, Rumanian, Yiddish 198
(in the syntax of the latter two, as well), for Gipsy in Slavic environment, 177 for most of the Uralic, Altaic, and Paleosiberian languages, and for Aleut and Alaska Eskimo.

Systems of Writing. In order to symbolize the sovereignty of the 212
Slavic language, St. Cyril invented a quite distinct alphabet, 177
adapting and modifying certain Greek, Samaritan, perhaps Coptic, and other Oriental letters. This alphabet, called GLAGOLITIC, was used in Great Moravia, and then in Bohemia and Croatia, Macedonia, and partly in Bulgaria. In the latter country it met strong competition from the so-called CYRILLIC alphabet which had been created there at the beginning of the tenth century to bring Slavic writing closer to the Greek—both Slavic alphabets occur in the fragmentary inscriptions of Preslava from the early tenth century. Cyrillic won out in all of the Greek Orthodox Slavic countries and is still used there in the Church, while for lay purposes it was refashioned under Peter the Great and the shape of the letters brought closer to the Latin: this modification spread from Russia to all Slavs of the Eastern rite. Since the twelfth century the Glagolitic alphabet has been limited to Croatia, except for isolated attempts of single Czech and Polish monasteries to borrow this Croatian habit in the fourteenth-fifteenth centuries. With the sixteenth century it began to disappear from secular Croatian writings and the area of its Church usage has become more and more limited, but after the Second World War spadework has been undertaken among Slavic Benedictines for a new extension of the Slavonic liturgy. With these exceptions all the Catholic Slavs now use the Latin alphabet. The fourteenth century Czech system of expressing those phonemes which have no graphic symbols in the Latin alphabet by various digraphs is still the basis for Polish spelling, whereas the Czechs have introduced the diacritic system, first tried by Jan Hus under the influence of the Glagolitic alphabet. This kind of spelling is now general for all Slavs of Western denominations with the exception of Poles and Kashubs.

5: Kemp E-4, 5 (1926-1933)1935

EF6 Serbs EF6

Croats EF4

Slavic Peoples E16

S
present in these practices, I would also ask whether there were SP
not some more tangible cult significance underlying this 778
giving of new vitality to trees. But this possibility and, for the 245
matter of that, this aspect of agricultural activity as a whole,
does not seem to have found a commentator, and I myself
have not yet sufficient instances to formulate a theory.

The respect for things in general is innate in the peasant, S
as countless small observances in everyday life show. So long SP
as this recognition persists, any object, however mean and 771
common, can on occasion serve in magic, without being 784
sacred; while if on the basis of special 'taboos' a list of sacred 778
plants and animals were made, it would be far too large to
allow of so many special cults or cult usages. Much less
extensive would be a corresponding list of cursed things,
which cannot under any circumstances be touched.

S
It must be remembered that the inventory of a peasant C
household (of the kind still out of touch with urbanism) is not 352
large, while in the mountains or in the hinterland of Dalmatia 356
it may not include all the primary necessities even of 415
a very simple life. In this simpler scheme domestic artifacts 788
and utensils retain something of their primitive significance. 778
In extreme cases domestic tidiness is a minor ritual; every
object has its proper place when not in use, and is carefully
handled, and put away in a special position, which must not
be reversed. The broom, the sieve, the kneading trough, the
scoop, the chains of the hearth pot, the gourd, etc., have had
their ritual associations amongst every people.

C
It is not possible to disentangle knowledge of the physical S
properties of substances from their significance in legend or 415
worship; and it would be equally impossible to trace whether 787
an object, used in divination, or a household utensil, which 778
seems to enjoy special respect, such as a sieve or a wood-block
or an axe, has a certain power ascribed to it directly, or
through an analogous association with some other category
of ideas.

The steam bath is noticed early for East and Northern SP
Slavs, but it is curious that after the Slav invasion, the 575
177

5: Kemp E-4, 5 (1926-1933)1935

EF6 Serbs EF6

Slavic Peoples E16

Albania EG1

SP Roman bath entirely disappears from the North Balkans,
515 although public baths were known to the Avars also. At the
[177] present time, the Turkish bath is restricted to a specific
cultural region, where a recent Asiatic influence has been
concentrated. As it now retreats this excellent institution also
S falls into decay. But the bath and the use of steam for
[515] sweating, now universal amongst the South Slavs, rubbing
[752] and massage, more or less symbolical washing and bathing,
and the manipulation of broken limbs and the dressing of
wounds, are to be reckoned amongst the oldest of their
S practices. Archaeological finds witness to healed wounds and
A fractures, but we know nothing of prehistoric trepanation
[752] amongst the South Slavs—the only European race, with the
Albanians and some Caucasians, which continued the practice
almost within living memory.

SP Offerings and vows, ritual performances and acts con-
755 nected with fertility cults, were the basis of mystical healing.
782 Hydrotherapy includes also the worship of water spirits, and,
amongst Lithuanians, of a personified watery element.
Niederle adds to this list of reconstructed primitive medicine
the use of oils or unguents which preserved strength and
health,[1] and a number of Eastern aromatics, known in primitive times.

S Plants introduced in historical times have added to the
SP botanical mythology, and enjoy a symbolism of their own;
177 just as field-glasses, pipe-lighters, petroleum, trains, firearms
773 and other more recent gifts of material civilisation, receive
789 their part in contemporary folk-lore, whose incorporating
activity is only now beginning to decline, and in some cases,
[372] a magico-religious part. Firearms have developed a complete
legend of their own; pipe-lighters are sometimes used for
producing ritual fire, though matches are universally disqualified; and so on.

S Wheat, which in the Middle Ages was cultivated only in a
241 very limited area, and, in the early nineteenth century, was
924 still little used in the interior of Serbia, has a universal ritual
778

---

[1] Cf. L. Niederle, *Slovanské Starožitnosti*, i, p. 187.

9:Megas I,B-5,4 (no date) 1951 EH1 Greece EH1

Serbs EF6
Bulgaria EE1
Slavic Peoples E16

[The Bulgarian House of the Mountains]

The only difference lies in the method of heating of the second room. This is not heated as the main room by an open hearth, but by a stove. This is the reason why this room is called soba (i.e. stove). In order to allow the smoke of the stove to escape through the chimney of the hearth, the latter is often built at the party wall and thus it is possible to feed the stove from the side of the hearth (see fig. 44).

SL B 342 354 C [342 171]

This system of heating, the combination of hearth and stove, the latter being fed on the side of the hearth, it is generally seen, in the Slav dwellings and is probably due to German influence (¹). The arrangement of the space, however, is in the Slav house entirely different from that of the Bulgarian one. With Slavs, and even with the Serbs of Bosnia the stove (Slav. pec) is in the main room, which originally constituted the entire house (called jisba or kuc'a); this stove took the place of the open hearth because of the German and Latin influence (fig. 45 $^{a-b}$). The ante-room, (pitvor) which originally had no heating, was changed into a kitchen with a hearth (called kuchyna in Czech or kyha in Serb) (²) since the time when the opening of the stove it was moved and opened on the party wall, so that the fuel could be cast from the ante-room; for in front of the mouth of the stove, a base for a hearth was thus created. (Fig. 45^{c} and 46).

B [171] SL 342 354 [177] ● Se [342 354]

---

inating from the Greek and are to-day used in the written Bulgarian language: gonia (γωνία)=corner; dilavia (λαβίς)=pincer; enghistra (ἄγκιστρον) =hook; kerami (κεραμίδι)=tile etc.

B 192 342

1) The word **isba** which is also used by the Bulgars, and means the house or rather the basement is found in Russian texts of the 10th and 11th centuries as «istuba» and originates from the German word «Stube», meaning a place for baths, equipped with a stove, and generally a warm place (**Niederle,** Manuel 2, 105. **E. Berneker,** Slavisches etymol. Wörterbuch, word istuba (istba, izdba, izba). According to **Niederle,** op. cit. p. 106 Note 3 «Slavs may have even before learned to know the very oven through their immediate relations to the Greeks (Romains) and the Greek towns of Pontos. The construction of the upper floor and other details of the Russian and generally the Slav house are also due to the German and Norman influence». (**Niederle,** ibid. 2, 108).

B [192] SL [177]

2) This changing of the ante-room (antichambre or vestibule according to Niederle) into a «cuisine à foyer» (kitchen with a fire-place) was not performed with all Slav peoples and is not older than the 11th cent. We do not see it with Russians, part of the Poles and Slovaks, who preserved the vestibule as a non-heated room (**Niederle,** ibid. 107 foll). Cf. **R. Meringer,** Das volkstümliche Haus in Bosnien und der Hercegovina in Wissenschaftl. Mitteilungen aus Bosnien VII, 1900 Wien, 248 foll.

177.10 ---177.88

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

The significance of this reaction was not missed by Moscow 186*
And so, whilst laying aside Panslav phraseology, she 177●
endeavoured to make Russian the sole 'cultural language' of the 19
Slav peoples. Hence the campaign to eliminate the teaching of 191
the French, English, and German languages—a campaign facilitated by the Marxist hold on power in the popular democracies, but combated by the hostility of generations educated on Western lines.

Thus the Soviet Union ensures two lines of penetration into Eastern Europe: Marxism and Russianisation. It used to be said that German was the Esperanto of the Slav peoples. Today the Kremlin dreams of making Russian a universal language.

It cannot be denied that the psychological role played by 186*
Slavism in the struggle which ended in the collapse of Germany was by no means negligible. But the peoples who led this struggle are today forced, by the Soviet Union's exploitation of the principle, to revise its very foundations. What they sought from it was the reconquest of their national independence; it was to this end that Slav solidarity was understood and cultivated amongst them.

Now this solidarity has been exploited by the Kremlin for the opposite purpose: the enslavement or absorption of their brothers in race.

Like causes produce like effects: the old instinct of *rénitence* 000
which roused the Slavs against Hamidean Turkey, Habsburg Austria, Kaiser William's or Hitler's Germany, will be unleashed tomorrow against the Moscow Dictatorship.

Panslavism is a pre-war legend. It became a political reality in international life only during the Second World War, to give way, in the new organisation of Eastern Europe, to Marxist solidarity.

Thus it lasted for four years only.

A. MOUSSET.

Paris.
January 1, 1950

Chapter Five

RUSSIA AS ARBITER OF THE SLAVONIC NATIONS

186*
178
IN the conditions under which it was realised, the liberation of Eastern Europe by the Soviet armies radically transformed the factors in the Slavonic problem. All the aims that the feeling of historical and racial solidarity had assigned to the Slavs were suddenly outstripped.

The First World War had resulted in their emancipation. As we have pointed out, this emancipation was due no less to the collapse of Tsarist Russia than to the victory of the Western Democracies. It had 'set up a home' for the Slavonic nations, free of mortgage on their national sovereign rights, without predominance of any one nation over the others. The two tasks imposed on them had been, on the one hand, the creation of inter-Slav ties—political, economic, and spiritual—on the other, a reorganisation of their relations with Russia.

The first of these tasks had been but imperfectly realised. The evolution of the international situation between the two wars was calculated rather to dissociate than to regroup the energies of the Slavonic world. And once again in history the Second World War had found the Slavonic nations in opposing camps.

As for relations with Moscow, they were diffident and inconsistent; where they did issue in positive agreements, these were hedged with cautious circumlocutions, and lacked a well-defined scope.

177
.64
642
177
.18
181
With the liberation, and the presence of the Red armies on their territory, the Slavonic peoples glimpsed a plan of their international life which was very different from the one they had known between 1919 and 1940. The new Governments had been formed under the eyes of the Liberator and, in the majority of cases, from elements devoted to the Soviet ideology. Under colour of 'anti-Fascism' a tidal wave swept away the old groups, accused of having, before or during the war, supported Axis designs. In reality the 'purge' marked an operation of a revolutionary nature, characterised by the rise to power of the

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

'Young Brigade', and by the predominance of the 'social' over 177
the 'political' and even over the 'national'. .64

This revolution was in the logic of events; was there any 177
need to invoke the ascendancy or the presence of Russia to .18
explain it? On emerging from an upheaval unprecedented in 181
their history, the little nations, stupefied by the blow and completely helpless, saw their recent past only as error or treason.

We cannot even reproach Russia with having bound up her action with a policy of patronage or aimed at an ideological synchronisation of the régimes born on the territories she had liberated. In Hungary, for example, she was very careful not to recreate the atmosphere of the time of Bela Kun, whose sinister memory, she found, was still alive.

But, in the Slavonic countries, the parties of the extreme 662
Left, almost everywhere identified with the Resistance, took advantage of the presence and the prestige of Russia in order to get into power and stay there. This led to a misunderstanding which, by associating the Russian authorities with the Governments which they were believed to favour, risked one day exposing the popularity of the Soviet Union in these countries to a turn in the tide of internal politics.

Obliged henceforth to gravitate in the orbit of the powerful 186*
Russian State, the Slavonic nations could not consider the future 829
from the same angle as they had done in 1918. At the conclusion of a devastating war, Russia would never again allow neighbouring States to serve as a diplomatic or military jumping-off ground for a possible adversary. She regarded them as her security ramp.

One might be tempted to see in this Muscovite hold over 648
Eastern Europe a revolution of an international order. In truth it was a revolution only in relation to an abnormal state of affairs—that of the 1920–1940 period, which rested on Russia's inertia in Europe. It could not reasonably be expected that this state of affairs would last indefinitely. The Europe of 1945 was more logical than that of 1918—at any rate, more in conformity with the classic play of international forces.

The slogan of Slav solidarity, which formed the *leit-motiv* 186*
of the Moscow Congresses of 1942–1944, had galvanised and 668
co-ordinated the movements for resistance to the invader. In 000

Chapter Eight

SLAV SOLIDARITY BREAKS UP

186*

WE have already spoken of the resurrection of the Slavonic idea during the Second World War—the only European conflict in history which found all the Slavs on the same side of the fence. We reviewed the congresses of 1942–1945 which restated the old themes of Slav solidarity, based on the liberating role of Soviet Russia. Never had such unanimity been shown within the Slav community. For the first time 'Panslavism' could be spoken of as a reality in international life.

186 728 175

This 'Panslavism', uniting the oppressed, occupied peoples against Hitler's Reich, was not to last long. It made itself felt again in 1946 and 1947, but in a purely oratorical form, and exclusively in justification of Russian ascendancy over the countries of Eastern Europe. In reality, it was again the Slavs who benefited least from the victory. While it is true that Bulgaria came out of the war with enlarged territory, this was due to an agreement concluded under the auspices of the Axis Powers. Czechoslovakia and Poland suffered the loss of a large part of their eastern territories. Yugoslavia recovered part of Istria, but her claims to Trieste and Southern Carinthia met with opposition from the Western powers, and were backed by the Russians only within the limits of their own interests. The state of affairs created by the Soviet Union within the area subject to its influence failed to reflect any Slavonic trend, or any preferential treatment for the 'sister nations'.

● 177 .18 186 648 175

The Kremlin is aware that the Slavonic world is an object of aversion to the Rumanians and the Hungarians. It can retain these in its orbit (into which it will try to attract Greece) only by lulling to sleep the old Slavophile ideology, or by relegating it to the rank of 'romantic values'. It is to the collaboration of Slavs and non-Slavs on the basis of Lenin-Stalinist Marxism that the Kremlin looks, for the creation of an eastern community modelled on its own institutions and obedient to its watchwords. From 1946 onwards its whole policy, in this part of Europe, aimed at directing the guidance of the satellite States more and more into the hands of the Communists. This policy was to be

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

pursued on parallel lines, in Slav and non-Slav countries alike. 177 .18

On the instigation of Moscow, these countries entered into 186
treaties of friendship and mutual assistance. These were so 648
worded as to give the impression, at first, of being designed to 175
wipe out long-standing heritages of hatred or distrust between peoples hitherto antagonistic to one another. Passed for a period of twenty years, and all on the same lines, these treaties were signed on the following dates:—

November 27, 1947: between Bulgaria and Yugoslavia.
December 8: between Hungary and Yugoslavia.
December 16: between Bulgaria and Albania.
December 19: between Yugoslavia and Rumania.
January 16, 1948: between Bulgaria and Rumania.
January 24: between Hungary and Rumania.
February 4: between the Soviet Union and Rumania.
March 18: between the Soviet Union and Bulgaria.
April 23: between Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria.

The commentaries which accompanied the signing of these [829]
agreements spoke, with ever-growing emphasis, of the 'peril' to the peace of Europe involved in the attitude of the Western powers. Centred at first on the German menace, they subsequently referred to fresh risks, clearly indicated. Thus the Soviet radio declared that the pact between Bulgaria and Moscow acquired significance from the fact that 'certain Western powers have, under the patronage of the United States, taken the creation of military blocs as the basis of their policy'.

Even the idea of a 'Balkan Federation', which in 1944 had found partisans in Moscow, was gradually pushed into the background, for fear that the essential core of this federation, the Bulgarian-Yugoslav bloc, might create a Slav community, which should one day grow strong enough to adopt an attitude of independence in regard to the Soviet Union. So, although it was originally inspired by Russia, this project for a union was later to be denounced by the Kremlin as a ruse of 'Western imperialism', and Dimitrov, the Bulgarian Premier, was to be disavowed by Moscow, in January, 1948, for having made an untimely allusion to it.

* * *

177
The standardisation of Soviet policy in Europe was to take 648 666
its definite shape in the conference held in Warsaw in September, 175

7: Lednicki S-4 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

tinguishing in that history," says Aksakov, no "beautiful effects," 186*
"bright array," no role for the individual; and because of that, 829
no pride and no memory for individual deeds. Every calamity is considered a punishment of God—every triumph an act of the grace of God. Thus "they do not erect monuments to their heroes, as there are none; but they build churches. . . ." "The history of the Russian people is the unique history in the whole world of a Christian nation which is Christian not only by religion but by its life—at least by the tendencies of its life."[10]

This was the idyllic picture of the Russian past as depicted by the Muscovite Slavophils. They considered that Peter the Great had ruined that beautiful past and brought Russia onto false roads of historical development. They were false first because they betrayed Russian national tradition, and secondly because they brought Russia to the West, which was in a state of decadence. I need not enter into too many details connected with the famous legend about the "rotten West"—a few examples will suffice. One of the leading Slavophils, Shevyrev, compared the West to a man spreading by his breath a terrible contagious disease. For Constantine Aksakov "West" meant violence, hatred, and enslavement; Russia—union, freedom, and peace. In his opinion even Russian paganism had been superior. This was why Russia, deserving it, had obtained a better Christianity; the Russian pagans had a *chayanie* (hope, expectation) of Christianity. The Russians accepted Christianization easily, without any struggle, like a child.

Now and then the Slavophils failed to confine themselves to 186*
Russia. They were looking for regeneration, for the restora- 829
tion of that shining, luminous past, but they were generous enough 177 ●
to spread the benefits of this regeneration outside of Russia too. .18
These benefits should be shared first of all by the blood relatives of Russia, the Slavic nations—and after them by the whole West-

---

[10] S. A. Vengerov, *Ocherki po Istorii Russkoi Literatury,* St. Petersburg, 1907: chapter on "Peredovoi Boets Slavyanofilstva Konstantin Aksakov," especially pp. 465-469, 470, etc.

186* ern world. The Slavs, organized around the holy Orthodox faith
829 and under the leadership of Russian autocracy, based on the strong
177 foundations of the Russian land community, would become a
.18 powerful political organization strong enough to bring the Western
world to the Russian pale.

186* Here we are already in the center of the Russian Panslavistic
178 doctrine. And this is, by the way, the picture of the whole He-
829 gelian road of the Slavophil philosophy of history: thesis, antithesis, and synthesis. Chicherin in his profoundly interesting memoirs, mocking the Slavophils and especially Constantine Aksakov, says: "He (Aksakov) conceived Russian history according to all the rules of Hegel's logic; the old Russia represented the statement, the new—the negation, and the future announced by the Slavophils was to be the restoration in a superior form of the original statement. This formula could be successfully applied perhaps only to the beard: the beard existed in old Russia, in the new it was shaved, in the future it would be restored."[11]

As long as the Slavophils were busy with their national costumes, traditions, orthodox theology, and glorification of the Russian past, they might be considered more or less independent, distinguished, and inoffensive satellites or offshoots of the official national ideology—but satellites and offshoots who confined themselves to the worship of what they considered Russian national
186* traditions. But when they extended their love to other people and
829 their hatred embraced not only Peter the Great but the West, they
668 became involved in political problems. And at this point some
of them degenerated into Panslavism; besides, some new adherents, acting in the purely political field, joined the Slavophil group. Here again we must take into consideration certain other sources of influence and tradition—this time purely political.

Some of the political conceptions adopted by the Slavophils appeared earlier—even at the time of Peter the Great and Elizabeth. From time to time conceptions of the liberation of the "Slavic brothers" emerged, but they developed especially strongly,

---

[11] *Vospominaniya B. N. Chicherina*, Moscow, 1926, p. 236.

61 Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

Chapter Five

RUSSIA AS ARBITER OF THE SLAVONIC NATIONS

186* IN the conditions under which it was realised, the liberation of
178 Eastern Europe by the Soviet armies radically transformed the
factors in the Slavonic problem. All the aims that the feeling of historical and racial solidarity had assigned to the Slavs were suddenly outstripped.

The First World War had resulted in their emancipation. As we have pointed out, this emancipation was due no less to the collapse of Tsarist Russia than to the victory of the Western Democracies. It had 'set up a home' for the Slavonic nations, free of mortgage on their national sovereign rights, without predominance of any one nation over the others. The two tasks imposed on them had been, on the one hand, the creation of inter-Slav ties—political, economic, and spiritual—on the other, a reorganisation of their relations with Russia.

The first of these tasks had been but imperfectly realised. The evolution of the international situation between the two wars was calculated rather to dissociate than to regroup the energies of the Slavonic world. And once again in history the Second World War had found the Slavonic nations in opposing camps.

As for relations with Moscow, they were diffident and inconsistent; where they did issue in positive agreements, these were hedged with cautious circumlocutions, and lacked a well-defined scope.

● 177 With the liberation, and the presence of the Red armies on
.64
642 their territory, the Slavonic peoples glimpsed a plan of their
177 international life which was very different from the one they had
.18 known between 1919 and 1940. The new Governments had
181 been formed under the eyes of the Liberator and, in the majority
of cases, from elements devoted to the Soviet ideology. Under colour of 'anti-Fascism' a tidal wave swept away the old groups, accused of having, before or during the war, supported Axis designs. In reality the 'purge' marked an operation of a revolutionary nature, characterised by the rise to power of the

'Young Brigade', and by the predominance of the 'social' over 177
the 'political' and even over the 'national'. .64

This revolution was in the logic of events; was there any 177
need to invoke the ascendancy or the presence of Russia to 118
explain it? On emerging from an upheaval unprecedented in 181
their history, the little nations, stupefied by the blow and completely helpless, saw their recent past only as error or treason.

We cannot even reproach Russia with having bound up her action with a policy of patronage or aimed at an ideological synchronisation of the régimes born on the territories she had liberated. In Hungary, for example, she was very careful not to recreate the atmosphere of the time of Bela Kun, whose sinister memory, she found, was still alive.

But, in the Slavonic countries, the parties of the extreme 662
Left, almost everywhere identified with the Resistance, took advantage of the presence and the prestige of Russia in order to get into power and stay there. This led to a misunderstanding which, by associating the Russian authorities with the Governments which they were believed to favour, risked one day exposing the popularity of the Soviet Union in these countries to a turn in the tide of internal politics.

Obliged henceforth to gravitate in the orbit of the powerful 186*
Russian State, the Slavonic nations could not consider the future 829
from the same angle as they had done in 1918. At the conclusion of a devastating war, Russia would never again allow neighbouring States to serve as a diplomatic or military jumping-off ground for a possible adversary. She regarded them as her security ramp.

One might be tempted to see in this Muscovite hold over 648
Eastern Europe a revolution of an international order.. In truth it was a revolution only in relation to an abnormal state of affairs—that of the 1920–1940 period, which rested on Russia's inertia in Europe. It could not reasonably be expected that this state of affairs would last indefinitely. The Europe of 1945 was more logical than that of 1918—at any rate, more in conformity with the classic play of international forces.

The slogan of Slav solidarity, which formed the *leit-motiv* 186*
of the Moscow Congresses of 1942–1944, had galvanised and 668
co-ordinated the movements for resistance to the invader. In 000

Congregation of the Holy Office, forbidding the publication and diffusion of Communist doctrine. 659 798 175

So the *Kulturkampf* was waged, now energetically, now quietly. The Prague Government was accused by the American Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, of violating 'human dignity and civilisation'; once more the conflict passed from the national to the international level, symbolising the ideological antagonism which exists between the Soviet world and the Western democracies. Neither the Government nor[1] the clergy showed any signs of weakening. On November 17 the bishops again asked the civil power to abandon the laws relating to religious teaching, as conceived by the State, and the interference of lay authorities in the nomination of priests and the administration of Church property. 648 829 659

The end of the year 1949 was marked by waves of purges in Communist circles, and by fresh trials on charges of treason, incriminating, like those of Budapest and Sofia, Tito's 'agents' or 'accomplices'. 661 175

* * *

During this period politics in Poland were somewhat less sensational than in the other Slav countries. There again, however, the régime of 'popular democracy' evolved in the direction of Stalin-Marxism. The struggle against the Church was less open, and did not, as in Czechoslovakia, go to the length of making the clergy civil servants. The Government concentrated its efforts particularly on increasing exports, on economic reconstruction, and on exploiting the German lands brought under its control—and these efforts, it must be admitted, were attended with remarkable results. 178 659 686 175

The German Question was its chief external problem; in its view, it was France's policy in respect of the Reich which prevented the renewal of the Franco-Polish treaty of alliance. What Warsaw particularly feared was lest a change of attitude on the part of the Allies towards Germany should reopen the question of the Oder-Neisse frontier, which the Poles considered sacrosanct, but which transferred to them territories whose final allocation was, legally, postponed until the making of the peace treaty for the Reich. 648 728 175

The most sensational event was the nomination (on November 7[2]) of Rokossovsky, the Soviet Marshal (of Polish 177 64 175

[1] [1949--Analyst]

[2] [1949--Analyst]

6t Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

•177 origin), as Minister of Defence in the Warsaw Cabinet; he took
•64 as his deputy General Wladislaw Korczye, Chief of Staff of the
175 Polish Army. This appointment was naturally interpreted as a
further step in the subordination of Poland to the Soviet
interests.

648 And the Polish-Sovietic *rapprochement* (at governmental
175 level) had an unexpected result: the expulsion or the trial, on the
696 ritual charge of spying, of French diplomats and nationals
(Wroclaw case), thus creating a state of tension between two
countries whose friendship had historic and spiritual roots of
such strength that no political vicissitudes had hitherto been able
to affect them.

* * *

186* Thus the events of 1948–1949 once more disturbed that
648 'Slav solidarity' which had been revived by the Second World
578 War. It cannot be said that there exist, between the Soviet
175 Union on the one side, and Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria,
on the other, ties which are stronger than, or of any different
nature from, those which unite Moscow to Budapest or to
Bucharest. The 'collaboration' operates exclusively on the basis
of Stalin-Marxism and obedience to Moscow.

On the contrary, the Soviet Union's Enemy Number One is Tito's Yugoslavia. There is violent and complete rupture between the Southern Slavs for the one part, the Bulgarians, Eastern and Northern Slavs for the other.

The historic current which has, periodically, split up the world of the Slavs, has reasserted its mysterious disintegrating force.

Two small but typical facts may serve as a postscript to this study. On Stalin's seventieth birthday the only country which sent no 'homage' to the master of the Kremlin was Yugoslavia. And the President of the Panslav Congress in the United States, George Pirinsky, was imprisoned in Chicago as belonging to an organisation aiming at the overthrow of the American Government by force.

186* dilection for the Ivans of Moscow and hatred for Peter the Great
829 were not justifiable. As far as the territorial expansion of Russia is concerned, the Russia of the Petersburgian period did not acquire or "liberate" fewer nations and lands than the tsars of Moscow.[30]

177 Besides, for every unprejudiced historian one thing is quite
53 clear—that the universal achievements of Russia in the field of
538 spiritual culture were genuinely connected with her collaboration with Western Europe. The Russian national genius was silent or inarticulate for centuries, and only when the magic wand of the West touched the Russian soul did the voice of Avvakum become the melody of Pushkin's poetry. How can we imagine all the great accomplishments of Turgenev, Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, Tschaikowsky, and Rimsky-Korsakov—in other words the Russian culture of the nineteenth century—without Europe and her inspiration? This point of view has been strongly stressed on many occasions by Russians themselves, first of all by Vladimir Solov'ev.

186* From the moral point of view the ideology of Danilevsky is es-
929 sentially immoral. Where messianistic arguments are adduced in support love changes quickly and easily into hatred. Danilevsky pays some official tribute to the slogans of "brotherhood" and "Slavic reciprocity" brought to the fore by the first Russian and non-Russian Slavophils. But the essence of his doctrine is pure national selfishness. "Life and theory," says Solov'ev, "somehow very easily and unnoticeably replace the just and human formula of the national idea by the formula of violence and national murder. Not by any means do all the advocates of this idea directly preach subdual and destruction of foreign nations; but there exist roundabout means, softer in appearance although just as murderous in spirit. 'Our nation, by its historical march and by the natural succession of national culture, replaces all other nations who have passed away and are passing away.' This 'replacement' also is not without a cruel, bloody struggle and various national murders, but the final result is attained as if by itself. Such a

---

[30] This point, by the way, was stressed by Pypin and by Sumner.

1: Niederle--60 E-5 1911 E/6 Slavic Peoples E/6
Sorbs

175
177 there; about 1700 they were in great measure Germanized; the last Slav group was that of the Dravani (Drawaina) in the district of Luchow which even today is called Wendland, country of the Wends.

● 17719 The Slavic language disappeared between 1750 and 1766. It was in 1751 that mass was celebrated in Slavic for the last time.[1]

161 In the years 1890-1900 the newspapers reported, according to A. Parczewski, that the census /94/ of 1890 had found 570 Slavs-Wends still in this region. But it was an error. The official census had indeed found in the Luchow area 570 Wends, but they spoke only German.

197 The Slavic tongue in this region has been dead for more than a century, as Mr. Muka reported without hesitation.[1] He was sent out as an investigator by the Academy of Sciences of Cracow.

000 However, the Slavic character is still found in great measure in the type and in the manner of life of the inhabitants of the Wendland.

101
175 Originally the Sorbs of this region[2] occupied in a compact mass all of the country situated between the Saale, the Verra*, the Fulda, the upper Havel, and the Spree. They extended as far as Frankfort on the Oder, on the Lower Bobra, the Hvizda (Queis). The group included the so-called Sorbs between the Saale and the Elbe (1) then the Lusatians on the middle Saale, and the Milczani on the upper Elster, the upper Spree and the Neisse. From the eleventh century on the Germans began to penetrate into these regions; but they only came there in large numbers beginning with the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. At this period the Sorb national group began to diminish to the west of the Elbe; it finally succumbed as a result of the Thirty Years War. The situation was better in /95/ Upper and Lower Lusatia, united under the Bohemian crown. Unfortunately, in 1635 the Treaty of Prague ceded
175 the territory to the House of Saxony. The Sorbian national group
668 commenced to decline, especially in Lower Lusatia. Its decadence was not arrested until the nineteenth century by the literary renaissance which restored some energy to this small people.

1. These Sorbs are designated in Latin texts of the Middle Ages by the name Sorabes. (Translator)

Thanks to the efforts of a few patriots, the national conscience

[2] [Wendland -- Analyst] [1] [Among the Polabian Slavs - Analyst]

7: Lednicki S-4 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

186* 829 The final conclusion is that the "immense Russian power pushes ahead, it cannot be quieted, it constantly must look to new arenas for its activity. The Slavic conscience strongly awakens in Russia . . . and it can not longer allow its relative tribes to remain in serfdom and shame. . . . To make of the whole of Slavdom a base is the only natural goal of Russian policy."[24]

4. Danilevsky (1822-1885)

The most radical Russian formulation of the Panslavistic program in its two directions—Constantinople and the Western Slavs—unified by a violent anti-Europeanism, was given by N. Ya. Danilevsky whose book *Russia and Europe* appeared in its first edition in 1871 and in its second in 1888 with a preface by another Panslavist, N. Strakhov. I cannot quote here the five hundred pages of this book in which the most fantastic idealization of the Russian past is married to the most vehement disdain and hatred for Western Europe and finally organized into a cynical political theory whose aim is to elaborate a system which would secure to Russia
186* 829 814 a permanent political supremacy in the world. Danilesvky's starting point is the denial of the conception of humanity and civilization as a whole, to which he opposes a conception of struggle between different cultural historical types based mainly on language groupings.

This conception of cultural historical types deserves special
[177 .81] attention. Danilevsky combined the theme of Hegel, according to which various nations appear in succession on the historical stage as consecutive and ever more complete incarnations of the universal spirit, with the idea of the German historian Rückert about the existence of separate cultural historical types. "For Danilevsky such a cultural historical type is realized by every tribe or every family of peoples characterized by a separate language or group of languages sufficiently near to each other . . . if that tribe or family of peoples is in general, by its spiritual disposition, capa-

---

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 158.